

ORIGINAL ENGLISH EDITION

INDEXED

APR 24 '39

V273  
\*DA

# The QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 540

APRIL, 1939

Vol. 272

1. Parliament in the Fifteenth Century.  
By Sir J. A. R. Marriott.
  2. Refugees in England.  
By William Zukerman.
  3. Ancient Classics in a Modern World.  
By Richard M. Gummere.
  4. The Spens Report.  
By Frederic Evans.
  5. History and Destiny To-day.  
By the Rev. Roger Lloyd.
  6. Planned National Economy.  
By Sir Cuthbert Headlam, Bart., D.S.O.
  7. Japanese Ambitions.  
By Stanley Rice.
  8. The Anatomy of Intelligence.  
By Edward Podolsky, M.D.
  9. Rumania.  
By Sir Charles Petrie, Bart.
  10. Octavia Hill.  
By Jacqueline Cockburn.
  11. The Roots of a Nation.  
By W. J. Blyton.
- Some Recent Books.

539-540

272

Jan-Apr

1939

541

273

Published Quarterly by

**THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**

*Sole Agents for American Continent*

131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK

Single Copies, \$1.75

Yearly Subscription, \$6.50

Entered at New York Post Office as Second Class Matter  
LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

# **TO SUBSCRIBERS**

# **AND AGENCIES**

Commencing with the January 1938 issue of the "QUARTERLY REVIEW," Subscribers will be supplied by the INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY, 131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK CITY, to whom all renewals and enquiries regarding this periodical should be sent.

**THE  
QUARTERLY  
REVIEW**

**No. 540**


**PUBLISHED IN  
APRIL, 1939.**

**LONDON :**  
**JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.**

**NEW YORK :**  
**THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**  
**1939**

*Entered as Second Class matter at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office*

**PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN**

 THE QUARTERLY REVIEW is published on or about the  
15th of January, April, July, and October.

Price Thirty-one Shillings and Fourpence per Annum, *post free*.

# THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 540.—APRIL, 1939.

## Art. 1.—PARLIAMENT IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

1. *History of Parliament, Vol. I. Biographies of the Members of the Commons House. 1439–1509. Vol. II. Register of the Ministers and of the Members of Both Houses 1439–1509.* Edited by Josiah C. Wedgwood, M.P. H.M.S.O., 1936–8.
2. *Interim Report of the Committee on House of Commons Personnel and Politics. 1264–1832.* Cmd. 4130. H.M.S.O., 1932.
3. *De Landibus Legum Angliæ* (ed. Amos, Cambridge, 1825) and *Governance of England* (ed. Plummer, Oxford, 1885) by Sir John Fortescue.
4. *English Constitutional Ideas in the Fifteenth Century,* by S. B. Chrimes. Cambridge University Press, 1936.
5. *Early Tudor Government,* by K. Pickthorn, 2 vols. Cambridge University Press, 1934.
6. *The Evolution of Parliament,* by A. F. Pollard. Longmans, 1928.
7. *Constitutional History of England,* by W. Stubbs, 3 vols. Oxford University Press (5th ed., 1903).
8. *The Lancastrian Constitution,* by T. F. T. Plucknett (ap. Tudor Studies). Longmans, 1934.

‘ENGLAND, the Mother of Parliaments’—John Bright’s famous phrase was eminently characteristic of the man, of his age, and of his school. That school—the ‘Manchester School’—was dominant in English politics throughout the first half of the Victorian era. Deriving its philosophy from Jeremy Bentham, it owed its popularity to the leadership of two Lancashire manufacturers, John Bright, who sat for Manchester from 1847 to Vol. 272.—No. 540.

1857, and Richard Cobden, who though resident in Manchester sat successively for Stockport, for the West Riding, and for Bright's home constituency of Rochdale. If, however, Cobden and Bright converted the country to Free Trade, it was Sir Robert Peel who, aided by the coincidence of the Industrial Revolution and an Irish famine, persuaded Parliament to carry the great series of fiscal reforms which in 1846 culminated in the repeal of the Corn Laws.

Free Trade was, however, only one application of a great principle. The ideal of Bentham and his disciples was liberty: individual, economic, and political; the less Government interfered the better, in matters of trade, of colonial administration, and in every other sphere of human activity. Does it savour of paradox to insist that the instrument on which the apostles of *laissez-faire* relied to achieve victory was a Parliament which has given birth to bureaucracy? But the question anticipates the sequence of events. Under a reformed Parliament and a Free Trade régime, England attained, during the Victorian era, to unprecedented prosperity and power. Undistracted by the recurrent revolutions which from 1789 to 1852 convulsed the Continent, England was able to concentrate her energies upon the development of industry, the expansion of overseas trade, and the maintenance of a mercantile marine unparalleled in size and efficiency. Protected from external assault by an irresistible navy, 'This precious stone set in the silver sea' became in literal truth 'the envy of less happier lands.' England's peacefulness and prosperity were by the more progressive countries of the world attributed, rightly or wrongly, to her Parliamentary constitution. They proceeded to imitate her. 'A series of undesigned changes brought it (the British constitution) to such a condition that satisfaction and impatience, the two great sources of political conduct, were both reasonably gratified under it. In this condition it became, not metaphorically but literally, the envy of the world, and the world took on all sides to copying it.' So Sir Henry Maine wrote in the 'Quarterly Review' for April 1883. Appositely he added: 'The imitations have not been generally happy.'

That result might have been foreseen. Political

constitutions are not exportable commodities. Not all the children of the Mother of Parliaments have arisen to call her blessed. On the contrary, a large proportion of the countries that in the nineteenth century attempted to copy the political constitution of England had cause to rue the experiment. By sad experience they learnt that of all forms of government parliamentary democracy is the most difficult and delicate. The experiment can succeed only if several exacting conditions are fulfilled. The experiment must be tried in the fullness of time ; if prematurely attempted, it is apt to result in a reaction to totalitarian methods and the acceptance of a dictatorship. Success depends, further, on the men who work the experiment : they and their forebears must, generation after generation, have submitted to an apprenticeship in the craft of self-government. Above all, as Oliver Cromwell perceived and insisted, parliamentary government presupposes a general agreement, among all sections of the people, on 'fundamentals.' No such agreement existed during Cromwell's régime. The Protector's repeated and genuine efforts to restore a parliamentary constitution were consequently doomed to failure. He himself regretfully but inevitably assumed the position of a dictator, relying for support, as dictators must, upon the sword. Since Cromwell's day, Parliamentary government in England has more than once been threatened by the emergence in the House of Commons of a Third Party which has refused assent to 'fundamentals.' Fortunately the threat has not materialised ; Parliamentary democracy, with its roots deep in the soil of centuries, has, in its country of origin, managed to survive.

The above observations, trite though they be, are irresistibly suggested by the appearance of the first instalment of a truly colossal work. It is anticipated that no fewer than forty volumes will be required to complete this 'History of Parliament,' and that at least twenty years' continuous labour must be devoted to its preparation. This great enterprise owes its initiation to the vision, courage, and persistence of one man. On Colonel Wedgwood Party ties sit somewhat loosely. Though he now adheres formally to the Labour Party

and was a member of Mr MacDonald's first Cabinet, he belongs unmistakably to the Manchester School. Cherishing a boundless belief in the sovereign virtues of liberty, he is inclined to identify liberty, perhaps too rigidly, with democracy, and in particular with that species of democracy which is based on the Sovereignty of Parliament. An ardent patriot, as he has proved in action, he has a robust faith in England and Englishmen, and he holds the engaging conviction that if other peoples were more like Englishmen all would be well with the world. But especially is he concerned that Englishmen themselves should look to the rock whence they are hewn, and in particular to the rock on which rests their Parliamentary constitution.

In order to sustain and nourish the national faith in that constitution, Colonel Wedgwood conceived the project of extending to the whole country investigations he had already conducted into the political history of his own county. What are the questions to which such an investigation should furnish an answer? He has himself formulated them as follows :

' . . . what was the state of society in which the institution of a Parliament first took shape? What were the reciprocal influences of the social conditions of these earlier times on the new institution and the gradual growth in its own power and ability to modify and control the environment in which Englishmen have lived? Why did Parliament perdure? Who were the men who came up to Parliament? Who summoned or sent them, and what reception did they find? What did they attempt year by year, and how much were they able to achieve? These are some of the problems which arise when it becomes a question of unravelling the tangle of the nation's history so as to lay bare any one of its major strands. Doubt and scepticism about the possibility of the task may all too easily arise. Some facts we can never know, as all record of them has disappeared. But, in spite of these gaps, enormous quarries of information exist which have never yet been worked to get the materials for the personnel of Parliament, without which no history can pretend to be adequate or "scientific." ' \*

That the questions can to some extent be answered, Colonel Wedgwood had assured himself by experiment.

---

\* 'Nineteenth Century and After' for May 1937, pp. 1, 2.

He is, moreover, convinced that only by pursuing the investigation can we hope to create that vivid sense of the vital forces by which men in Parliament have built England as we know it to-day. Constitutional historians have been apt to concentrate on the 'institutional' development of Parliament. Not so Colonel Wedgwood. It is the personnel of Parliament—and both Houses of it—that he desires to illustrate, and so to exhibit 'the social and personal significance of what has hitherto seemed to be an abstract political institution.' The criticism thus implied on the method pursued, and the results achieved, by constitutional historians in the past, is not, perhaps, wholly without substance as regards the mediæval period; it is less true of the history of Parliament in the sixteenth century; and dull must the student be who can miss the 'social and personal significance' of Parliamentary history during the last three centuries. It might, then, have been more prudent had Colonel Wedgwood limited his investigations to the Middle Ages. But he would not be Colonel Wedgwood if he had. So the work is already planned down to 1918, and if the hopes of its first editor are fulfilled it will end only with the extinction of the English Parliament.

Plainly, an enterprise so vast could not even be initiated, much less carried through, by an individual, however ebullient his enthusiasm. In March 1929 Mr Baldwin, then Prime Minister, was accordingly persuaded to appoint a committee consisting of six members of the House of Commons, seven historians and antiquarians, and a Treasury official, to report, 'on the material available for a record of the personnel and politics of past Members of the House of Commons from 1264 to 1832, and on the cost and desirability of publication, while safeguarding Public Funds against any large charge for collecting, editing, or publishing the materials.'\*

This Committee reported that the task was feasible and recommended that it should be undertaken.

'The importance of Parliament itself is a measure of the importance of its history. It is not necessary for us to stress that importance either now or for the last 670 years. We were the first people to govern ourselves through responsible

---

\* 'Interim Report, p. 5.

representatives. We may be the last. The institution is so peculiarly English, has been so envied by other nations, and has been so widely copied and discarded and fought over, that the world has come to accept parliamentary government as a symbol of freedom. Parliament has acquired a sentimental value altogether distinct from its real utility or power. There is now a pride in it as a visible national emblem. Nor is Parliament a cold and remote abstraction. It must always be to us a long series of assemblies of men who were our ancestors. There are histories of the institution. There are also histories of its actions. But of the men who gave the institution life, who shaped it and in so doing shaped our history and even our minds, no record has ever been attempted. The reason is that the task has been too great for any private histories to attempt. This Report itself will indicate how great the task must be, and show the necessary research as being far beyond one man's powers.\*

So the Committee reported—not unimpressively. It further expressed its belief that a 'valuable piece of work' could be prepared and written within five to ten years, at a cost of about 30,000*l.*, and that such a sum could be raised by an appeal to the English-speaking peoples with the approval of His Majesty's Government and Parliament. The work was, however, to be confined to the personnel of the House of Commons, and to be carried down only to 1832. Incidentally, it may be added that this 'Interim Report' is in itself a document of great value. Containing, as it does, a summary of work already done on the subject, a classified analysis of the materials available for compiling a complete list of members, and a series of exceedingly useful appendices, the Report will undoubtedly be recognised as indispensable to constitutional historians in the future.

But then came a lamentable aposiopesis. The 'Interim Report' has had no successors. The Committee which produced it was dissolved, and a fresh Committee, consisting entirely of members of the two Houses, was in 1932 appointed to consider ways and means. Primarily, perhaps for financial reasons, this Committee decided to enlarge the undertaking so as to include the House of Lords and to carry the history down to 1918. An appeal was issued and sufficient funds were

---

\* 'Interim Report,' p. 52.

assured from private sources to justify the Treasury in undertaking (July 1934) the cost of publication and placing on sale the successive volumes. All receipts from sales were to go to the Treasury, which, it was anticipated, would be fully indemnified therefrom. Beyond that, the Treasury has assumed no responsibility whatever, either for the work itself or for the editorial and other costs involved in its production.

The first instalment of a work which has now become a history not only of the House of Commons but of Parliament, deals with the period between 1439 and 1509. Volume I, containing the Biographies of the members of the Commons House, appeared in 1936; volume II, which is devoted to a Register of the Ministers and members of both Houses, in 1938. The announced intention is to complete the work by a series of general or 'Conclusions' volumes, which will 'trace the growth of the institution; and will illustrate its development with documents, debates, and monographs on various aspects of Parliamentary History.' Provided that the writing of those 'Conclusions' volumes is entrusted to really competent historians, they should be of great value to students. But whether any of them will appear before the other thirty-four volumes are completed is uncertain. Meanwhile, in the two volumes already published, students are in possession of a rich mine of information which no constitutional historian can ever venture in the future to ignore. Let it be understood, however, that these volumes constitute not a history of the selected period, but only materials of undeniable importance for the completion of the picture which it will be the business of the historian to paint. 'Here, then,' writes Colonel Wedgwood, who has himself edited both volumes, 'is Parliament in the 15th century, and the men who composed Parliament.' 'The men' of the period 1439 to 1509, yes; we see them as we have never been able to see them before. But 'Parliament in the 15th century,' no. With all deference to a most devoted editor and with full appreciation of the rich fruits of his labour, one serious criticism cannot be repressed. In defining his period Colonel Wedgwood has surely been guilty of an error of judgment. The years 1439 to 1509 do not constitute a 'period' which any professional historian can recognise.

That the 'period' was not indeed selected haphazard is clear from the editor's Introduction to volume I. 'It covers,' he writes, 'that turbulent period of English history which extends from the eclipse of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester to the settled, stable accession of Henry VIII' (p. iii). True; but accepting the year 1439 as the year of 'the eclipse' of Gloucester, what constitutional significance attaches to that event?

Any History of Parliament in the fifteenth century must indisputably begin with the Lancastrian Revolution of 1399 and end with the death of Richard III on Bosworth Field. The selection of any other *terminus a quo* or *terminus ad quem* betrays the hand of the genealogist or antiquarian and seriously impairs the value of 'The History of Parliament' for the scientific historian.

To the investigation of the constitutional significance of the fifteenth century a great deal of valuable work has already in recent years been devoted. All that work must, indeed, take as its starting-point the brilliant chapter with which Bishop Stubbs opened the third volume of the great work which for several generations has been accepted by all serious students as the 'standard' of historical scholarship. Candour does, however, compel the confession that to many readers the very name of Stubbs is a synonym for the dry-as-dust historian. It is consequently deterrent. The imputation is unjust. As a fact, despite severe compression, Bishop Stubbs was a master of terse and vigorous English, a brilliant portrait painter, and the coiner of many epigrammatic phrases arresting and unforgettable. Many of his conclusions have, in detail, been questioned and some have been corrected by later commentators. Inevitably. Of Stubbs's critics Dr Pollard is, perhaps, the most eminent, certainly the most provocative and destructive. In his brilliant work on 'The Evolution of Parliament,' he dismissed as a 'myth' the idea—fundamental in Stubbs's conception—that the English Parliament was originally based upon the principle of 'Estates.' That principle was, Dr Pollard contends, imported in the fifteenth century from France, where the *States General* did in fact represent the 'Three Estates.'\* If the theory of the Three Estates was

---

\* 'Evolution of Parliament,' p. 70.

a myth, the doctrine of the peerage is, according to the same critic, a 'fiction.' 'Peerage,' he says, 'had been a juridical concept in Magna Carta; under Edward II it was turned by a limited class to political purposes; but the vogue of hereditary peerage as a foundation of the constitution is a modern growth, born of antagonism to Stuart and then to democratic principles' (p. 100).

Then as to the bicameral structure of Parliament. Dr Pollard does not, of course, deny that this form was eventually evolved, but he points out (quite accurately) that on the most solemn occasions Parliament 'still acts as one body, and not as two Houses,' and he insists that 'in the fourteenth century, the "houses" had neither been organised nor reduced to two.' But the point on which Dr Pollard lays special stress is that the legislative function of Parliament has been antedated, and that its original and primary function was not financial but judicial. He recalls the fact that we still pray for the 'High Court of Parliament,' though he neglects to mention that that prayer only came into the Prayer Book in 1662, and that in the Bidding Prayer we were, and are, exhorted to pray for the 'Great Council of the Realm now assembled in Parliament.' The conclusions so confidently stated by Dr Pollard have not passed unchallenged. During the last few years an immense amount of labour has been bestowed by scholars upon the early history of the English Parliament, and not least upon its development in the fifteenth century. The list of works prefixed to this article gives a very imperfect indication of the scope of these investigations. Nor would it here be possible to attempt a general review of the results achieved by them. One or two illustrations must suffice.

Miss M. V. Clarke's essay on 'Mediæval Representation and Consent' is a remarkable example of the results attainable by intensive criticism, applied with the ardour and equipment of a real scholar, to a particular document—the *Modus Tenendi Parliamentum*. Miss Clarke has not only retrieved the reputation of a much depreciated document but has made it the basis of an elaborate study of parliamentary institutions as they existed both in England and in Ireland in the early years of the fourteenth century.

More directly bearing on the subject under review

are the studies of Mr Plucknett and Mr Chrimes. From Mr Plucknett's initial proposition no genuine historian can withhold sympathy. 'It is hard,' he says, 'to imagine a more difficult feat of historical imagination than that required of one who would picture the English Constitution in 1485, having first freed his mind of every thought and bias derived from the seventeenth century and the present age.' The observation is true and pertinent; but was any historian ever less obnoxious than Bishop Stubbs to the charge of reading history backwards?

The main propositions advanced by Stubbs, in reference to the fifteenth century, can be summarised very briefly. He stated (i) that the Lancastrian revolution initiated the trial of 'a great constitutional experiment, a premature testing of the strength of the parliamentary system'; (ii) that the experiment failed not because it was intrinsically bad, but because it was premature; (iii) that the 'constitution had in its growth outrun the capacity of the nation,' that 'the Lancastrian Kings were weak administrators at the moment when the nation required a strong government' and that their dynasty fell from 'lack of governance'; and (iv) that the government of the House of York was stronger though less sound than that of the Lancastrians; that 'the Lancastrian rule was a direct continuity and the Yorkist rule was a break in the continuity of Constitutional development,' and anticipated the methods of the Tudor dictatorship.

Mr Plucknett, relying upon the arguments brought forward and the judgments given in four noteworthy cases recorded in the 'Year Books,' definitely questions the accuracy of Stubbs's propositions. He holds that 'the uneasy feeling which has long been held about the "Constitutionalism" of the Lancastrian kings is thoroughly justified'; that so far from being responsible for the trial of a great constitutional experiment, the Lancastrians 'blindly groped in a wilderness of private law,' and that it was the Yorkists who saw the 'first beginnings of a constitution in the modern non-feudal sense.'\* Mr Pickthorne in his 'Early Tudor Government' has outdistanced Mr Plucknett in the reaction against Stubbs. To him the fifteenth century had nothing

---

\* 'Tudor Studies,' pp. 180-1.

which 'can very usefully be called a constitution. . . . Before the sixteenth century all there was in England in the way of a constitution' was 'the mediæval idea of the supremacy of the law.'

From the acute controversy thus indicated, Mr Chimes stands somewhat apart. He is clearly in sympathy with the 'uneasy' feeling expressed by Mr Plucknett, though it must be noted that the latter did not specifically dispute the 'general truth' of the proposition that 'the fifteenth century had witnessed an inordinate growth of parliamentary and constitutional rule which had far outstripped the nation's progress in other directions.' Mr Plucknett did, however, suggest that 'the later splendours of the constitution have been reflected backwards upon the fifteenth century, throwing certain features of it into undue relief, and enveloping the whole structure with an appearance of maturity and completeness which is in fact illusory' (p. 161). Above all, he insisted that 'however familiar the forms of Lancastrian government may seem, the spirit within them is completely alien to modern thought' (p. 181).

Mr Chimes has fixed upon Mr Plucknett's suggestion, and in the course of four erudite essays has submitted it to an exhaustive analysis. The first essay deals with the King, the conception of kingship, and the place of the Crown in the constitution. The general effect of the argument is to show that while the King was 'indispensable,' the rules by which he succeeded to his 'estate' were not precise, nor was his power unlimited and unconditional. As to Parliament, with which the second essay deals, Mr Chimes after noting the paradox that the creature came, in course of time, to limit the power of its creator, questions the accuracy of the assertion made by the late Dr Tout that it was not until late in the fourteenth century that public opinion became interested in Parliament. He maintains, on the contrary, that by that time 'Parliament had, in one sense or another, figured prominently in the national life for more than a hundred years.' On this point Mr Chimes is strongly supported by Colonel Wedgwood; and that support, as will presently appear, is of the highest possible significance. Mr Chimes agrees with Dr Pollard—and with everyone else—that the notion of Parliament as a High Court of Law has been

'permanent, explicit, and reiterated,' but insists that 'it gradually changed into an institution which eventually functioned in ways not consonant with such an origin, but rather in the manner of a popular representative assembly acting politically with the sense of a sanction and an authority emanating not only from the King and his Writ but also from its own or the people's will.' This development was, he agrees, very slow, but, in opposition to Dr Pollard, he finds the link between the judicial and political conception of Parliament in the rejected 'myth' of the Three Estates, and shows how, during the fifteenth century, 'the old idea of the three-fold division of society facilitated the definition of the estates as the three orders of lords spiritual, lords temporal, and commons . . . and how, moreover, Parliament itself was conceived to be the three estates of the realm' (p. 115).

As to the bifurcation of Parliament into two 'Houses,' he shows that the term 'House of Commons' can be traced 'from the very beginning of the fifteenth century.' He admits, indeed, that at that time 'House' might or might not have been used merely in the locative sense—a building or meeting-place—but he insists (again in contradiction of Dr Pollard) that before the end of the century the term had 'acquired a definite institutional sense indistinguishable from its modern connotation.'\*

It will, then, be observed that Mr Chrimes is in substantial agreement with what we learnt long ago from Dr Stubbs (III. 430 f.). It may well be that on some points of detail—as, for instance, the precise significance of the Parliament of Leicester (1414) in relation to the necessary concurrence of the Commons in legislation—Bishop Stubbs needs to be corrected. Yet even here the tide of criticism would seem to be flowing towards the acceptance of Bishop Stubbs's conclusions. In particular the important work of Professor H. L. Gray of Harvard † affords recent indications of the set of the tide; and it does not stand alone. It is, however, proper to add that Mr Chrimes's work was not put forward as a history of Parliament in the fifteenth century. His object was 'to investigate the spirit behind the forms of fifteenth-

\* E. H. R., XLIV. 495.

† 'The Influence of the Commons on Early Legislation' (Milford, 1932).

century government' to interpret the half-expressed concepts and ideas behind the machinery of government. To this object his fourth essay, 'The Theory of the State,' is in particular devoted; but the whole work belongs to the sphere of Political Theory rather than to that of constitutional practice. As such it is of conspicuous merit, though entirely distinct in scope and purpose from the stupendous work sponsored by Colonel Wedgwood.

To that work we return. Against the editor's delimitation of his period a protest has already been entered, and there is another point, a suggestion rather than a criticism: would it not save both labour and expense if to each pair of volumes there were prefixed a single Introduction? Might not the texts themselves also in future instalments be with advantage consolidated? As things are, the Introductions contain a certain amount of repetition and in several respects would gain by concentration.

Apart from a few general observations on the Parliament of the fifteenth century, the points emphasised by Colonel Wedgwood, and illuminated by him with a wealth of detail hitherto unattainable, may be reduced to five: (i) the position of officials, ministers, or placemen in Parliament; (ii) the composition of the House of Lords; (iii) the composition of the House of Commons; (iv) the constituencies and the electorate; and (v) the emergence of embryonic 'Parties' in Parliament. In order to extract the maximum of advantage from all the erudition lavished upon these subjects by the editor, the student will be compelled (as one student has been) to make elaborate analyses for himself and to rearrange the material scattered over the two Introductions. That students will be richly rewarded by that process goes without saying; but much of their labour, not to add much paper and printing, would have been saved had a more systematic method been adopted by the editor.

To descend to detail. Much valuable light is thrown upon the position of Royal Officials in Parliament. The organic connection between the Legislature and the Executive has long been regarded as a fundamental feature of the English Constitution, in contrast, for example, with that of the United States. But historians

have been wont to ascribe it to the development of the Cabinet system in the eighteenth century. Colonel Wedgwood finds more than embryonic traces of it three hundred years earlier. The Lists of each Parliament in Volume II are prefaced by the names of the holders of a number of offices, including such disparate offices as those of Chancellor and Lord Chamberlain, and Chief Butler and Clerk of the Parliament. These officials, Colonel Wedgwood describes, rather daringly, as 'the Ministry or the Council' (I. v and xxviii), and in the superior officials in both Houses he finds (still more daringly) 'the germ of a Cabinet Committee' (II. cxxxv). This is surely a much more serious anticipation of later developments than anything attributed by critics to Bishop Stubbs. But an even more novel point is Colonel Wedgwood's insistence upon the large number of lesser officials who found places in one or other House of Parliament. 'If,' he says, 'we include the Treasury in Ireland and in Calais no less than seventy Members of Parliament at some time held office in the Treasury' (I. xxxi). Over 10 per cent. of the total membership of Parliament were elected because they were 'King's servants' (I. xxx); about 130 members of the Commons held at some time command of the Royal castles. 'These Members of Parliament were mostly soldiers and in some cases were elected to Parliament by reason of their Constablenesship' (I. xxvi). Throughout the seventy years covered by these volumes 'the feared and hated placemen adopted and controlled the Parliament of the nation (II. xci), and they have to-day their exact counterpart in those Under-Secretaries, Junior Lords, and Parliamentary private secretaries whose agreeable function it is to listen, to sympathise, and to exalt before all comers the wisdom and the government of their Chief.' This, incidentally, is one of the not infrequent asides that indicate that Colonel Wedgwood's thoughts, however deeply he may be absorbed in antiquarian research, are never far away from the green benches at Westminster to-day.

The Legislature, ancient and modern, is, indeed, the main theme of these volumes. In reference to the House of Lords the editor shows that out of the lay hereditary peers summoned to Parliament—never exceeding 55 in number and sometimes as few as 30—no fewer than 25

had previously sat in the House of Commons. Of the 70 judges and lawyers, increasing from eight to twelve per Parliament, summoned, in this period, to the House of Lords, fifteen had previously sat in the Lower House. Not all the lay peers who sat had, however, been 'summond.' Some writs may, of course, have been lost, but we are warned that lost writs must not always be assumed in order to justify 'unexpected presence in Parliament'; nor did a writ of summons to one Parliament establish 'a *right* to writs to all future Parliaments.' Custom, as the editor pertinently adds, 'was not yet law.' On the other hand 'there is hardly any direct evidence (apart from the wording of the writ) that a writ of summons did not indicate, if not confer' during the period under review 'an hereditary dignity. Harington is the only instance of a man left out permanently after having had a writ, though there are thirty six discovered cases of men sitting with no writs' (II. lxi-lxiii). It is, moreover, noticeable that 'peers-by-patent failed to get writs quite as often as did lords who had had writs of summons' (II. lxxv). Plainly, the whole problem of the mediæval peerage remains exceedingly difficult and obscure, and though Colonel Wedgwood deals with it in great detail, his conclusions are mainly negative.

Upon the composition of the House of Commons, upon the social status of members and their relations to their constituents, upon the varying amounts of 'allowances' and the regularity of their payment, as well as upon the constituencies and the electorate, these volumes throw a flood of light. Membership of the House of Commons is shown to have been to a large extent hereditary. As regards social status: of 700 knights of the shire, 180 were already knights and 140 were subsequently knighted; and all but 130 were county justices of the peace. Of 1900 burgesses, on the contrary, only 150 ever attained to that dignity; perhaps 10 per cent. were lawyers and 50 per cent. had been or became sheriffs—though not of course during their tenure of a seat; most of the burgesses were, seemingly, men of substance, mayors and ex-mayors, rich merchants and so forth; and of complete 'carpet-baggers' there were only some 300 out of 2000 members, though non-residence was permitted in 1442, was encouraged in 1504, and tended

during the period to increase. Payment for members was legally 4s. a day for Knights of the Shire and 2s. a day for Burgesses (the equivalent of 8*l.* and 4*l.* to-day), but some very important cities, like London and York, paid more; many paid less or nothing. By 1439 'perhaps most boroughs had got out of the habit of paying at all' and many were apt to prefer a candidate who offered to forego their 'wages,' and Knights of the Shire were 'finding it increasingly unpopular to demand and difficult to get their 4s. a day.'

All this detail leads up to the two most novel, most interesting, and most important points elicited by this painstaking investigation. The first is that the 'pocket-borough' was no novel invention of the eighteenth century (cf. I. xxxiii, lviii), and that even in the fifteenth century the creation of new boroughs was often due to an increased desire for patronage and political influence. The other and even more novel fact is that even at that time a seat in the House of Commons was 'sought after almost as keenly as to-day, and for much the same personal reasons. To be there in the House gave to the elected the impression of power and inspired respect' (II. cxlv). Some members got peerages; many got knight-hoods; and many are the cases discovered by the editor in which the Member of Parliament got some privilege or job (I. xxxvi-xxxvii).

Preceding paragraphs have, of necessity, failed to notice many points of interesting detail that emerge from Colonel Wedgwood's exhaustive if unsystematic analysis. Among broader issues the editor rightly insists upon the supreme political importance of the representation of all parts of the country in one great central assembly; upon the close association of executive, legislative, and judicial functions secured by the presence of officials and judges in the Great Council of the Realm assembled in Parliament, and upon the increasing tendency to exclude from the House of Lords, officials, especially minor officials who consequently tended to seek election to the House of Commons. Colonel Wedgwood's investigations would seem then, in their broad result, to substantiate the general conclusions reached sixty years ago by Bishop Stubbs. On detailed points Stubbs needs, of course, to

be corrected. But all Colonel Wedgwood's researches come to nothing if they do not demonstrate that, in a Constitutional sense, the fifteenth century was far more advanced than recent critics have been willing to admit. England was making a great political experiment, not perhaps in the narrow sense imagined by Stubbs, but certainly in the broader sense revealed by Colonel Wedgwood.

One lesson taught by Stubbs Colonel Wedgwood does, however, ignore; and, to the political commentator of to-day it is of all the lessons incomparably the most significant. Stubbs insisted that the 'Lancastrian experiment' was premature, and that in its premature trial we have the true explanation of its failure. At no time in world-history has it been more important to insist upon that truth than it is to-day. Parliamentary institutions are not for all countries, nor for all times. They cannot succeed except where a people is ready and the time is ripe. Prematurely attempted they lead inevitably to reaction. Of premature experiment dictatorship is the natural corrective. If the power of the dictator be unduly protracted or mischievously misused, dictatorship will in turn breed its own distempers. The temporary discipline of a dictatorship may be not merely inevitable, but educative and wholesome. So was it, in the sixteenth century, in England. That the same expedient, adopted elsewhere, under parallel circumstances in our own time, may not be prolonged beyond the period of utility, and may tend, as in our own case, to ultimate edification—a rebuilding of the structure of the State on sound foundations—is the earnest hope of all who view contemporary affairs with detachment, sympathy, and understanding.

J. A. R. MARRIOTT.

## Art. 2.—REFUGEES IN ENGLAND.

THE Refugee Problem has lately assumed proportions which are positively bewildering. A product of the World War, it has increased instead of decreasing with the passage of time. The problem of the Russian and Greek refugees in the early 'twenties was child's play as compared with the problem of the German refugees as it appeared soon after 1933, and that, too, was eclipsed by the same issue after the Austrian Anschluss. With refugees now pouring in from Germany, the former Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, Danzig, Hungary, Rumania, Italy, and Spain; with humanity of every description, nationality, class, type, and character overflowing practically every frontier of Europe like a rising flood, the problem has become one of utmost complexity. The category 'refugee' no longer unites people so widely heterogeneous into a single mass with the same character and requirements. Latter-day Fascism has not only raised the question to the position of a world problem like unemployment, war, dictatorship, and other major curses of mankind, but has also changed its content and given it a meaning and diversity which it has not had before.

It would be futile to attempt to treat such a problem as a whole in an article. One must limit the subject drastically if one is not to be lost in the maze of questions encountered at every step. In the present contribution the subject will be limited to a brief study of several types of refugees frequently met with in England. The larger economic, political, statistical, and other aspects of the problem are deliberately eliminated. The subject is also limited to England only. It is true that England is not one of the most representative of refugee countries. The number of its exiles is comparatively small, only between twelve and fifteen thousand, and they are mostly of a type which is not typical of the bulk of the refugees on the Continent. But England occupies to-day a key position in the refugee problem. While it provides a place of permanent refuge for only several thousands, it serves also as a clearing-house for thousands more who spread from here to every country in the world in search of a new home. As in the days of the great transmigration of peoples from Europe to various countries overseas

in the last decades of the nineteenth century, England now, too, serves as a temporary resting place, a sort of inn for scores of thousands of people fleeing from European tyrannies and oppression to new and freer worlds. England's geographical position on the threshold between Europe and the New Worlds and also her political position as one of the last great bulwarks of Democracy in Europe make her a most suitable place of temporary refuge for the great tragic mass of humanity which is now being uprooted cruelly and scattered over all the seas. In this respect England presents a good observation post from which a view is gained of the various types of refugees from all over Europe as they are leaving their old and embarking for their new homes. One gets a glimpse, as it were, of uprooted humanity in the very process of its uprootedness and in its first efforts at adjustment to new environments. It is possible that some of these observations may be of aid in understanding the refugee situations in other countries and even the entire problem in all its tragic complexity.

Until the Austrian Anschluss of March of last year, the refugees in England were limited exclusively to one particular type of people which differed widely from other types of refugees as hitherto known in Europe. The latter were mostly political refugees who, whether they belonged to the Left or to the Right, were in the first place social idealists, nonconformists if not revolutionists. They were all in conscious, if not active, opposition to the particular regime of their native land and for this reason were forced to leave their homes. Their exile was thus voluntary. If they had abandoned their opposition to the regime or had made peace with it, they could have remained at home and been spared the tortures of exile. There was a certain dignity and pride about their fate which only suffering for an ideal gives to people. Whether one agreed with their views or not, one could not help admiring their courage and idealism.

For reasons not easy to explain, England, which in the nineteenth century was the traditional place of refuge for political exiles and still is the strongest bulwark of Democracy in Europe, did not extend a welcome to the political victims of the Nazi regime. With the exception

of a few internationally-famous political exiles, England has practically none of this type. The bulk of the political emigrés of the Nazi regime has found its refuge in France and, before the Munich Agreement, in Czecho-Slovakia. The refugees who came to England from 1933 to 1938 were mostly non-political, business men and professional people who stood not above but aside from politics in Germany. They had no particular quarrel, political, social, or even religious, with the Nazi regime as such. They would willingly have remained under it and served it well had they been permitted to do so. If Hitler had not been mad on his racial theory and not persecuted them so vilely, they might have been among the most ardent patriots of the Third Reich. They are in exile not for anything they did or even thought, but for what they are by accident of birth. Their 'crime' is not of ideas, but of blood; not of beliefs, but of race. Europe has never before known of such refugees. They are entirely a product of Fascism.

While this adds a certain pathos to the suffering of these people, who are persecuted for no volitional reason of their own, it nevertheless cannot change the fact that they belong to a certain category which is entirely outside the sphere of intellectual interests and social or religious idealism. They are, it is true, innocent victims of oppression, but they are not free and willing bearers of suffering for the sake of a political or religious faith. They had a Cross thrust upon them, as it were, against their will, almost without their knowledge. Gladly would they throw it down, but the cruel task-master does not let them. They are obliged to carry a crown of martyrdom without being martyrs in spirit or in mind, and are almost without understanding of what it is all about. Why should they, good, solid business men who never mixed in politics, never took sides even in religion (for most of them were not even religious Jews, but so-called 'konfessionslose,' i.e. without faith affiliation)—why should they be chosen for a halo of martyrdom for which they have no taste or understanding? They lack the background and spiritual strength of the exiled socialist, communist, and democrat refugee, or of the Orthodox religious Jew who is not only conscious of his suffering, but also knows the meaning behind it. For the same

reason they lack also the interest and colourfulness which an intense social or religious idealism adds to an individual or group and makes them attractive despite their foreignness.

A good illustration of this latter point are the Russian emigrés of all parties who are still to be found in every capital of Europe. Whether they belong to the pre-revolutionary type of anti-Tsaristic emigrant or to the post-revolutionary anti-Soviet type, these Russian refugees are an interesting and charming lot of people who have considerably enriched the cultures of every society among which they lived in appreciable numbers. One may predict a similar result from the streams of Spanish refugees who are now pouring into France. But one fears that this will not be the case with these Nazi refugees, and this not because the Russians and Spaniards in general possess in great abundance that elusive quality of charm and interest which the Germans lack so woefully, but because this particular class of people, be they German, English, or Russian, lack the idealistic background and intellectual make-up which evoke interest, colour, and charm. Sedate, solid, and stolid German burghers, they are the very incarnation of that dull, conventional respectability which is nowhere so heavy as in Germany. In spirit they are not refugees and they do not consider themselves as such. It is pathetic to hear them say, as they so often do: 'We are not refugees. We came over from Germany voluntarily.' Despite the apparent innocence of this remark, it is essentially correct. They are not exiles in the sense in which that term has been known in Europe until now. They are too conventional and respectable for any kind of opposition or revolt. They are in exile through a piece of stupid irrelevancy which they do not understand and rightly do not acknowledge. They are good, middle-class, present-day Germans, for all Hitler's and Streicher's theories. Every evening when they come home from business they switch on Berlin or Hamburg on their radios and bathe in the waves of German speech, propaganda, music, and sentimentality. On a Sunday night they go to Kempinsky's in Regent Street, a miniature copy of the expensive eating-places on Kurfuerstendamm, eat a Wiener 'Schnitzel,' sip German lager, and sigh heavily while listening to the blonde Aryan beauty who

sings sentimental ditties of West Berlin, and wonder why they are in Regent Street and not on Kurfuerstendamm. The difference between them and Russian emigrés, Orthodox religious Jews, or the German political refugees in Czecho-Slovakia and France is the difference between people who have gone through an internal revolution together with an external, and those who have been tossed about by a great storm without their knowing and understanding its meaning. They have learned nothing from the hurricane which has uprooted their lives and cast them on a strange soil; they have remained the same burghers that they were; they are not interested in reconstructing their old world, but merely in transferring it from Kurfuerstendamm to Piccadilly; their physical world has been upset, but their spiritual world has remained untouched. That is why in any Russian emigré restaurant one can still detect even now, after twenty years of exile, an air of wistfulness and beauty which lingers like the scent of a faded rose, while at Kempinsky's one is merely smothered in slushy sentimentality.

If these people have a distinct spiritual and artistic disadvantage in comparison with other refugees, they also have many practical advantages. In industry and business they are the most enterprising, progressive, and able class of people in Europe. In many respects they are the nearest approach in Europe to the American self-made men and captains of industry. It is they who have expanded German business at home and abroad and made it the formidable competitor of English and French trade of to-day. It is they who have made German business efficiency famous and laid the economic foundation for the Nazi challenge to the world, and it is quite possible that their elimination will mark the beginning of the end of that challenge. Most of them have succeeded in salvaging the bulk of their capital, which they have brought to England; but, more important still, they have brought into the country a wealth of business experience and connections which cannot but result in a great increase of British wealth and economic power. They are transferring from Germany important business enterprises which England has never known; they are introducing into England the newer and more progressive methods

which the conservative English business men were slow to adopt. They are bringing in that cosmopolitan spirit which British business lacks and in which German business excelled so much. They are bringing in new energy and a love of work which the easy-going English business man, with his long week-ends and interest in sport, does not possess. Already they have established over seven hundred enterprises, most of which are new to England. These employ over fifteen thousand British workers, more than the total number of permanent refugees admitted into England. They have already transferred a good many of their old factories and recaptured their old world connections. British export already feels the fillip of their work and enterprise, and before long the energy which has built up the ports of Hamburg and Bremen and has sent the German merchant marine across the seven seas will doubtless be felt even more strongly in England. In short, England has already benefited hugely from the blind policy which has so brutally uprooted these people; and it does not require much perspicuity to realise that in the industrial, business, and financial fields Great Britain will be the greatest beneficiary of the German loss caused by the Nazi aberration.

Another advantage which this type of refugee has above others is the ease with which they adjust themselves to new environments and rebuild their homes on the new soil. With the Russians, for instance, one can find that twenty years after their exile thousands of them are still not adjusted to their new homes, and thousands more never will be. They do not strike roots easily in new soil; the majority of them are not successful away from their old homes and certainly are not happy. But one can predict almost with certainty that in less than half that time these German refugees will be so thoroughly assimilated with their English, American, or Dutch environments as to be indistinguishable from the rest of the population. The very lack of finer, idealistic qualities makes the process of their adjustment easier. They are not troubled by the too great conflicts of the political refugee or by the brooding of the Russian. They are the stuff success is made of, the material from which the pillars of the big business world are built. They just fit into

Mr Chamberlain's England, and like all post-War Germans they have an exaggerated respect for it amounting to a reverence which can easily pass into love. This, incidentally, is the reason why they have chosen to come to England instead of to France and Czecho-Slovakia with their more politically-minded friends. Like most middle-class Germans, including the Nazis, they have always looked up to England almost with awe as the peak of political and financial solidity, and when the storm broke they very prudently and willingly decided to settle in the country of their admiration. The British Government, too, evidently realised early in the Nazi regime the advantages to England of a financially select and able group of business refugees, and opened its doors to them with greater readiness than to the more intellectual and idealistic, but financially less stable type.

Like all other immigrants during their first years in their new home, they too have shown a tendency to group together. This they have done in a part of Hampstead and Golders Green, which can now be termed the first German colony in London. During the five years of their slow infiltration they have succeeded in adding a certain foreign tinge to these suburbs of London which marks them out sharply against the uniform London scene. In no other city in the world are foreigners so noticeable as in London. In Paris, New York, Berlin, or Vienna the comparatively small number of refugees which London has received would pass almost unnoticed, but in London they are conspicuous and they leave an impression much stronger than their number warrants. One easily recognises these people, particularly the women-folk, by a certain Continental air of elegance about their dress, make-up, and manners. But, above all, they are recognisable by their harsh, guttural German speech in Berlin accent, which they speak at the top of their voice in buses, undergrounds, cinemas, streets, and other public places. Why they should love to display their German speech so prominently is difficult to know, for most of them speak English well with the German accent which certainly sounds pleasanter to English ears than the harsh sounds of Prussian. Perhaps it is a species of ordinary exhibitionism prevalent, particularly among women who wish to stand out from the crowd ; perhaps

it is simply German tactlessness applied to the simple things of life, but the fact is that these people parade their German speech in public with an aggressiveness which sometimes jars on British ears. There are now streets in Hampstead and in Golders Green where German is spoken as in any German city. Certain London buses, particularly in the north-west district, resound with feminine voices discoursing in German louder than in any Berlin vehicle. Good-humoured English conductors have learned to announce their stops in a Cockney German, and the famous London Bobbies on their beats in Hampstead and St John's Wood have learned to answer questions in German. But apart from these people, whose good nature is proverbial and almost professional, I doubt whether the average Englishman and woman take very kindly to this public flaunting of foreignness.

Yet it would be a grave mistake to assume that these refugees are unassimilable, clannish, inclined to the formation of colonies or ghettos of their own as distinct from the rest of the population. Nothing can be further from the truth. The fact is that they are the most assimilable people in the world. In Germany they were on the verge of merging completely with the German population until Hitler came and pushed them back literally by force into group distinction. The same process of rapid assimilation is going on amongst them in England and in every other country where they are transplanted. The attempt to force them back into a ghetto will doubtless prove Hitler's greatest failure. They have not the character and personality necessary for a ghetto; they have not enough distinction to differentiate them from others. One can easily predict that within a few years the colonies in Hampstead and in Golders Green will disappear without leaving a trace. These people will lose no time in running away from their own group when they no longer need it, and will blend with the English middle-class, which is their highest aspiration in this earthly life. No greater mistake can be made than to compare the German colony with Whitechapel and these refugees with the Jews of the East End. They do not feel as Jews in spite of Hitler and they take little or no interest in Jewish affairs. All Hitler's and Goebel's propaganda has not succeeded in making them even realise the existence of a

Jewish problem. They consider themselves Germans who, through some unfortunate human aberration, have been driven out from the Vaterland and must, therefore, rapidly become English. In a few years they will have disappeared in England as a stone thrown into a pond. The City of London will be augmented with a few more top-hatted brokers and bankers; the Port of London with a number of able exporters; the shopping districts of some English towns with some efficient shop-keepers; and industrial England with a number of enterprising manufacturers. All that will be left of them as a group will be something to be exploited by the British Fascists as an additional reason for anti-Semitism in England.

It was only after the Austrian Anschluss that England began to get an appreciable number of refugees of another type, one of an entirely different character from the comfortably situated ex-German burgher and business man. The Austrian Anschluss marked a turning-point not only in the political fortunes of Nazism but in its entire make-up and character. Until March 1938 the Nazi regime had not, as it were, found itself, or it had not, at least, fully manifested its real self to the outside world or even to many of its own followers. Aggressive and brutal from the beginning, the regime had nevertheless advanced cautiously, was sensitive to world opinion, and careful not to shock too much the moral susceptibilities of the world and of its own population. Thus throughout the first five years of Nazidom, with the wildest anti-Semitic drive in modern history, Germany was not stained with a single big pogrom of the Tsaristic type. Even in its anti-Semitism the Government was careful to observe the outward decencies of civilisation. With the Anschluss came a sudden change; all caution was abandoned; the mask was thrown off; all efforts to impress the world were deliberately given up; the beast which was held in leash was let loose and the world was horrified by sights of brutality and sadism hitherto believed impossible in civilised Europe. A big, well-organised, twentieth-century State deliberately, and with a certain pride in its action, went back to mediæval barbarism and proceeded calmly to exterminate physically the entire Jewish community living in its midst. Never before has anything like this

been attempted, still less executed with so much savagery and on so big a scale.

The effect on the refugees was direct, violent, tremendous. With the Anschluss there began a flight from Germany which cannot be compared with anything in all the previous years of the Nazi regime. Hitherto only the well-to-do and those who could take with them some of their belongings emigrated; emigration was more or less planned, directed; places of refuge were chosen. Now began a rush which rapidly developed into a stampede of people running for their lives as from war, air-bombardment, pestilence, or some calamity of nature. They ran naked and hungry, without the most necessary belongings, with and without prospects of settlement anywhere, with and even without permission to enter any country. Thousands perished in the illegal crossing of frontiers, in no-man's-lands, in concentration camps; thousands of others escaped into practically every country in Europe, no matter how zealously guarded and tightly closed to immigration; some managed to penetrate also into the Island across the Channel which hitherto had been the refuge only for the most select among Nazi victims. It is obvious that this tragic army of afflicted humanity, running blindly from the worst scourge known to mankind, the unleashed fury of human beastliness, was of an entirely different class and type than the earlier refugees who 'left Germany voluntarily' and formed German colonies in smart suburbs of London.

To begin with, these newer victims of Nazism, in their overwhelming majority, are tragically and heart-breakingly poor. Most of them did not belong originally to the rich, not even the comfortable class. They were mostly artisans, skilled workers of every description, professionals of the type who have not reached the point when a profession becomes a good business, medical practitioners, dentists, teachers, journalists, authors who do not write best-sellers, artists of every variety, clerks, salesmen, and all that great army of white-collar workers who are the least secure of workers and at best hover on the verge of poverty all their lives. The ruthlessness and brutality of the Nazi regime after the Anschluss had deprived them of every source of income even before the physical pogroms came and turned them into charity cases long before they

had left their homes. In addition, the Nazis, in accordance with their new policy of stripping their victims naked before driving them out, looted them officially and unofficially of every bit of their worldly possessions and sent them out in search of a new home as near to destitution as people can be.

One can see these tragic victims of a new kind of war in peace-time standing in long queues before consulates and offices of relief committees in every capital of Europe. One sees them also crowding the waiting-rooms of the London relief organisations, particularly at the best known of them, Woburn House, the headquarters of the German-Jewish Aid Committee in London. They are a quiet, orderly, clean-looking, well-dressed crowd, in appearance better dressed than any similar crowd of English would be. As most of them are Viennese, they have retained that elusive 'chic' which distinguishes the Viennese and Parisian crowd from any others. But there is something pathetic about this very 'chic' and elegance, the pathos of the exaggerated correctness and immaculateness of dress which one often notices about the unemployed clerks and white-collar workers applying for a job. Like the unemployed, these people, too, depend with their last hope upon the external impression they make and they bestow too elaborate care on their personal appearance, the women in particular.

Most of these refugees are from Vienna and Austria in distinction from the earlier comers from Berlin and Prussia, and the difference is apparent to any experienced European observer. They have the vivacious eye, the charming smile, the grace of figure, the dignified, almost aristocratic air and demeanour, in short the charm which the Germans almost demonstratively lack and which evokes so many beautiful memories of the cafés and boulevards of a once lovely city of waltz and music. To this natural quality of the Viennese there is added in this particular crowd the quick wit, temperament, colourfulness, and suppressed passion of the East-European and Galician Jews who lived in thousands in Vienna and now figure prominently among the refugees. No other people in the world embodies in such concentrated form the fire, vitality, and genius of the oppressed Jewish race as this particular group, the last reservoir of a rapidly melting

and disappearing people who have added so flaming a tinge of colour to almost every culture in Europe and in the New Worlds overseas.

True, even this crowd lacks the conscious idealism of the political refugee, the dignity and courage of the intellectual rebel who takes exile upon himself willingly. But it already carries within itself the blind spirit of unconscious protest which is the soil from which conscious revolt eventually springs. Most of these people have seen Nazism at work ; they have seen, and probably experienced, the terrible havoc it has wrought in human bodies and souls. They have seen others and probably themselves have been beaten, flogged, humiliated, forced to crawl in the gutters and dance in the streets for no other reason than the sadistic joy of their tormentors. They have been driven out from the parks, boulevards, cafés, cinemas, and public places of their beloved city which they, more than others, made lovely and famous. They have seen everything which they cherished wantonly destroyed, their own little world razed to the ground, the honour and dignity of man dragged in the mud. They have felt the hot breath of the unleashed beast upon them and will never forget the horror of it. One cannot imagine these people making peace with the Nazi regime even if the persecution against them were to cease. Temperamentally, psychologically, economically, socially they are instinctively in opposition to everything that Nazism stands for and not only against its racial madness. If they had remained in Germany they would form the nuclei of revolt against the regime, even as their brothers of a former generation and in another land of oppression formed similar nuclei for the overthrow of the Tsaristic tyranny. Outside Germany they will carry within themselves the memory of the suffering and human destruction which they have seen, and their spirits will forever rise against Nazism and Fascism in whatever form or place they find it.

These people, one fears, will never make respectable bankers, brokers, merchants, shop-keepers, and captains of industry. But they would be honest toilers in workshops, factories, offices, and shops ; they would do good, skilled work with their hands and brains for the enrichment and benefit of the community of which they would

become a part. They would heal suffering humanity, brighten life with their music and art, and quicken thought with sharp wit ; they would add a dash of colour to a grey, humdrum existence and a spark of revolt to a self-satisfied society. They would help to create wealth instead of selling it for a profit ; they would work themselves instead of giving employment to others. In all probability, they would live in the East End of London or on the south side of the Thames instead of at Hampstead ; they might not crash so quickly into the drawing-rooms of the British middle class and become undistinguishable from their hosts, but they would surely assimilate more truly the spirit, intellect, and culture of the people of England. Above all, by their personalities, lives, and occupations they certainly would decrease the smouldering ill-feeling against the Jews instead of increasing it.

But these people are not wanted in England. Their skill, their work, their eagerness to toil and serve, their knowledge of suffering, their instinctive protest against evil and oppression, their talent, colourfulness, all are unwanted. England wants new industries, commerce, enterprises which can give employment to workers, but not men. For reasons of their own, the rulers of England have decided that, out of the wreckage which the Nazi storm has brought to British shores, they are to gather in the solid, palpable goods of the world which can be seen, measured, and appraised in terms of the known and approved values, instead of the intangible and ephemeral goods of the spirit and character. And, therefore, most of the refugees of the post-Anschluss period will have to leave England. They are here only temporarily as in a clearing-house, or as men gather in an inn during a storm or an avalanche. They are not allowed to settle here, look for work, or remain for any length of time. They are merely given temporary refuge until they find places to go to where they can strike new roots.

Where will they go when their time comes to leave ? Who will have them ? What will they do ? No one knows ; still less, they themselves, as they stand shivering before consulates, offices of immigration societies, and refugee aid committees. The modern world has probably never seen a profounder despair. But there is one bright spot in this sea of otherwise unmitigated tragedy : these

people have not gone through the hell which they did without having extracted from it the great lesson which it contained for them and which will affect their entire future life. The revolution from without has, for them, wrought a revolution within. They know instinctively, even if not intellectually, that their problem is not merely in finding a new home to which they can transfer the content of their old world, but in reconstructing their lives on entirely new bases. Most of them have realised the pathos and uncertainty of their white-collar occupations and the ease with which their urban existence can be destroyed. There is, therefore, a strong tendency among them now to turn away from the artificiality of city life and to engage in less genteel but more healthy physical work. One sees them, while they are waiting for chances to emigrate, training on farms, in workshops, in domestic service, digging earth, breaking stones on roads, learning mechanical trades, preparing for a simpler but healthier life than that which they had led before. One sees this and realises that the storm which raged in their lives was not in vain. They are a rejuvenated people in whom suffering has awakened a new realisation of the insufficiency of their old lives together with a determination that they should never again be caught in a similar storm and be cast about the earth at the whim of any tyrant or the wayward mood of any mob.

From the ranks of these people come the pioneers who go in their thousands to Palestine, if permitted, to work on the land, fight for their place in the sun, and lead a simple, physical life. It is they who would also go out to the wilds of Africa, Australia, South America or any other free area to build a new home for themselves, a simple home without the comforts of the big city, but where they could live in independence, keep their human dignity, and not be told by every demagogue and dictator that they are 'superfluous' and must move on. There is a new spirit among these people which leads them anywhere where the centuries-old cruel game of making the Jew the scape-goat for every social evil and misfortune has a chance of being ended once and for all. A realisation is growing among them that their particular refugee problem is closely connected with the bigger Jewish problem and that there can be no radical solution of the one without

the other. The Russian Tsaristic pogroms of two generations ago had the effect of creating among the Jews of that period a movement for land colonisation which later developed into Zionism. The Nazi pogroms of to-day seem to have a similar effect of producing the same kind of a movement, but on an extended, wider front and without any political-nationalistic frills. Instead of a single National Home in Palestine, the tendency now is for the establishment of many Jewish homelands in various parts of the world, but all based on the same principle of independence and healthy agricultural life as in Palestine. If this more universal ideal could be harnessed to the new determination of these refugees to recreate their lives, their tragedy would not have been in vain. For it would solve not only their present problem, but also the larger one, out of which other situations like that of the present arise periodically to shake the civilised world.

WILLIAM ZUKERMAN.

## Art. 3.—ANCIENT CLASSICS IN A MODERN WORLD.

1. *The Foundations of Modern Education*. By E. H. Wilds. Farrar and Rinehart, New York, 1936.
2. *Modes of Thought*. By A. N. Whitehead. Macmillan, 1938.
3. *The Ancient Classics and the New Humanism*, an essay in the volume *On Going to College*. By E. K. Rand. Oxford University Press, 1938.
4. *A Plea for a Plan*. By The Very Rev. C. Alington. Longmans, 1938.
5. *The Haverford Plan*. By D. P. Lockwood. *Journal of Higher Education*, Columbus, Ohio. Pages 308-14. Vol. 1, no. 6, June, 1930.

LATIN, 'and less Greek,' may be the object of much controversy at the present day; but there is no doubt that within their limited scope and for the purposes of the classicist himself, they are being well taught and are maintaining their dignity in the academic curriculum. From the first-year teacher to the university professor we have observed an actual growth in vitality and efficiency since the publications of the British Royal Commission and the American Classical League. There is thus no necessity for any reforming or uprooting in the methods of presenting the ancient authors to clearly convinced classical students in the English-speaking countries. But there is a need for adaptation to modern demands, for new methods of presentation in a world where science and economics are dominant, for the benefit of the student who possesses a genuine interest in the ancient authors and yet must omit them from the academic programme because they do not seem to have any answer to his vocational needs. Unless this can somehow be accomplished, Latin will dwindle and Greek will disappear.

In the field of culture, no less than in the world of nature, adaptation to changing conditions is essential to preservation as well as to progress. If those who uphold the value of the ancient tradition are correct in their belief that at six or seven great transitional crises of cultural thought during the past fifteen centuries the classics have played a vital part, one may indulge the

idea of another re-creative process, built up in a new way upon the old foundations and adapted to the *mores* of the twentieth century. Voices are already being raised in support of such a procedure. To secure a harmony, a constructive plan for progress, among these various critics and friends of the classics, especially in view of the world's need for some of their serenity, would be another factor in the co-operation of the English-speaking peoples. The writers who sense the need of this re-interpretation, whether in the school curriculum, the college lecture-hall, or the non-academic hurly-burly where, as Professor Whitehead declares, 'civilised beings should survey the world with some large generality of understanding,' have already made some helpful contributions.

One feels a deep sympathy for the older generation, which learned Horace's Odes by heart, read Plato's 'Republic' unhurriedly, and by gradual accumulation proceeded to a comfortable degree. These men had the technical paraphernalia of scholarship, together with the arm-chair love of the ancient literatures. Furthermore, their interest often extended into other fields. They would worship at the shrine of Arnold and Newman. They were tolerably well read in English and modern languages; occasionally they ventured from scholarship into creative literature. This was for them an entirely adequate set of principles and criteria. Science was a force to be reckoned with, respectfully acknowledged, and counted as one of the modern trends which challenged but did not damage the serenity of the ancient gods. Social studies—history, government, economics—had their right of way; but it was parallel rather than contradictory. Thus the knowledge of Greek and Latin, with all its side-paths and cross-roads, led them to a happier mental journey's end than any other single approach. You might have seen them during the past forty years listening rapturously to Butcher, the translator of Homer, to J. P. Mahaffy, that wit-cracking Celt from Dublin, to the incisive diatribes of Paul Shorey. They gathered enthusiastically as spectators of a play in the original Greek, or in a translation by Gilbert Murray. They would speak at meetings of various organisations in a spirit of serene confidence, quoting Anatole France's essay

'Pour Le Latin' and cheering loudly when the Greek requirement was put back into the French lycées by the Ministry of Education in 1924. There was the Princeton volume on the 'Value of the Classics,' Livingstone's 'Defence of a Classical Education,' and all of J. W. Mac-kail's exhortations to sweetness and light. General approval manifested itself recently at the statement of a world-celebrity that the German spiritual debacle was due to the substitution of vocational methods and to the neglect of the tolerant spirit, the eternal values, inspired by the study of the classics. Mr Santayana and Mr Hutchins were taking care of the Platonic tradition and keeping it alive in a dignified way—the one as applied to philosophy and art, the other as applied to the fundamentals of American education.

Now, however, we seem to be wavering, not in our allegiance, but in our point of view. There seems to be a flaw in the belief that this Absolute, this 'Live-Alone-and-Like-It' creed, this policy of complacency will survive in an age of transition and testing. One doubts whether it is possible to stand pat in the confidence that, both for the scholar and for the cultivated person generally, the third-dimensional black-and-white of every cultural picture is painted in a Greek and Roman setting. There is a feeling, on searching the inner mental sanctuary, that one has not met the problem or kept up with the march of progress. It is said that the classical style is defunct and that the beloved classics are declining just because they have failed to adapt their message to a changing world—that they are gliding, for this reason, down into practical oblivion with Hebrew studies, knight-hood, chaperons, the hansom cab, and possibly the steam railroad. This doubt has been clearly expressed in the 1938 Presidential address of Professor T. R. Glover, at the annual meeting of the British Classical Association :

'Is it possible that, intent upon the means, we forget the end? And that our pupils, unaware of what we forget to tell them, assume that the means are all? Very much as if our colleague of the vocational side spent years in teaching his students the use of hammer and brace and saw, yet never suggested any real application of carpentry to domestic or other purposes, but maintained that to realise the difference between the tools, and to know how to hold them, was

enough in itself. . . . Is History merely what happened to Alcibiades? Or ought we, with Polybius, to think less of what happens in our chosen decade and more of what is going to happen—of what, in short, shapes the next age—of the forces and factors, personal and otherwise, that *make* history—saints, emotions, inventions, and Empires included? . . . Some readers, with no hold upon grammar, like John Keats, can achieve this, while the grammarian very often comes, in Plato's phrase, to the door of the Muses and goes away empty. . . . We need, as Carlyle put it, operating changes in our ways of thought.'

One has a sneaking suspicion that Dr Glover is right, and that certain present-day prophets, whose warnings have so far gone unheeded, are correct in recommending a totally different procedure from that which has been followed during the past five decades. It is no longer possible for the ancient classics to live and function—or even to gasp for breath—if they are interpreted by schoolmasters who have regard mainly for forms and grammar, by college professors who lecture as if the scholars sitting before them were all candidates for advanced degrees, and by elderly men and women who rhapsodise, however charmingly, about the glories of ancient literature.

A few forward-looking thinkers, who believe that a different procedure will bring about the Renaissance that this machine-age needs, have examined, as an economist would examine, the causes and motives that have in past generations brought about a renewed interest in these very classics. And, though it is not fashionable to say so, they have proved clearly that a utilitarian motive always has introduced this renewal of interest. Let us look at the facts.

The Christian Fathers clung to the past of Republican and Empire Rome, with its occasional excursions into realms sympathetic with Christianity, because they desired a link with respectable tradition and a source for future inspiration. That is why St Augustine harked back to Cicero's 'Hortensius,' St Ambrose echoed much humanitarian Stoicism, and some unknown rhetoric-student patched up the forged correspondence between Seneca and St Paul. The devil must not have all the good tunes—or all the good books, either. This incor-

poration of old into new, in spite of visions and warnings about what would happen to worshippers of heathen ideals, was the keystone of all the new development from the viewpoint of publicity, workmanship, and education. The illuminated manuscript of a pagan author was a thing of beauty; but it was also a useful medium for the expression of new ideas. This principle governed much Church writing—all the way from the Venerable Bede's histories and Alcuin's reform of Charlemagne's educational system, to the adapted Aristotelianism of St Thomas Aquinas. And it is astonishing, to one who reads carefully the Quaker propaganda of William Penn, to find arguments for the Inner Light traced back through Clement of Alexandria to Epictetus, to Socrates, to the earliest of the Greek philosophers. The New Faith which risked or endured martyrdom in the Catacombs was a fundamental force in itself; but for purposes of converting the educated pagan it seized upon the natural medium of writers and apologists. What disgrace could there be in such a procedure when St Paul himself used this method for introducing the Message to his Athenian audience?

Various manifestations of this revival in England, in many cases off-shoots of the European Renaissance, are based upon more than mere æsthetic appreciation of the ancient authors. Colet, More, and Erasmus; Elizabethan drama and the rich literature of the seventeenth century; Locke's restrained use of the classics in his advocacy of formal discipline; imitation of the Florentine and Milanese leaders who found ancient art and letters the best material for their powerful patronage system; geographic exploration with Strabo and Ptolemy as the elementary text-book; the revival of Plato by the Cambridge seekers after a democratic religion. The Age of Reason in the eighteenth century acknowledged its debt in a dozen concrete ways. All these processes were based upon a clarifying utilitarianism, which idealised itself into great movements in new directions. Church, State, literature, humanism, transcendentalism, and the actual business of the day, all were quickened with the aid of re-interpreted classical authorities.

One would not expect such a wide sweep of influence in Colonial America. But here, apart from the later

popularisation of Plato by Emerson, the trend was distinctly political. One hundred and sixty years ago a new instrument of government was in the making—both a declaration of principles and a constitution meant to embody such principles. Englishmen and Americans alike recognised its fundamental merits. In order to find out the best that had been thought and said in the past on the subject of freedom and self-government, the debates of those assembled on two occasions in Philadelphia offered illustrations ransacked from Greek and Roman sources as well as the common-law heritage of the Anglo-Saxons. Jefferson admitted that into the Declaration went no specific materials, but rather a reflection of Cicero, the Stoics, Justinian, and Aristotle. Madison and James Wilson used Thucydides and Livy to back up procedures applicable to modern problems. John Adams reported to the Continental Congress passages from Tacitus which applied to concrete and critical situations. It may be retorted that, since this classical medium was the material in which all educated men worked in the eighteenth century, they would naturally turn to such confirmatory sources. But, whether one admits this as the main driving-force or not, one notes that the classics stood for the Americans of the Colonial period as the practical tool for the government of a growing people, and as the main inspirational as well as utilitarian agency for the New World Republic.

If this is a correct summary of the situation, no amount of glorification or reminiscence or idealistic advocacy will put the study of the classics back into their proper position in the curriculum and the cultural picture. The programme should be one which appeals to the engineer, the scientist, the interpreter of modern social forces. And the first thing for all lovers of and believers in the ancient languages to do, is to understand that the classics form the most important element of the *second* rather than the first flight of one's studies and hobbies. Omitting any change for the few whose job or hobby the ancient languages may be, we must plan a policy which will convince all persons interested in real culture that these studies are a vital concomitant to half the courses in a university, and an indispensable tool to all dealers in ideas.

The appeal of Professor A. N. Whitehead—for a re-interpretation of Plato in terms suited to modern progress—may be regarded as the model for those who are interested in any phase of the ancient tradition. If this periodic revival of Plato has marked unforgettable milestones in man's history of thought, why not one more stage, in harmony with the modern forces of science and the social framework?

We might establish, without abolishing any of the present-day procedure in our colleges and universities, a new avenue of approach—flexible, tutorial, and individualised—to be called 'Applied Classics' or 'classics for the non-specialist.' The student who wishes intensive training in Greek and Latin, or one ancient and one modern language on a comparative literature basis, need not change his procedure. And the classics-lover who is not planning further than an arm-chair reading knowledge of Horace or the Greek lyric poets, Vergil or Homer, Tacitus or Herodotus—aided by parallel reading in translations sponsored by university presses or the Loeb Library, the American 'Debt to Greece and Rome' series, the Budé collection, or the mastery of some historical period of antiquity—may still pick and choose until he has acquired a use of the necessary tools. But it is the utilitarian features which we are especially neglecting. We think of scholars in English who find they need Latin for their researches. Cases occur of drama students who lament that they have not had the opportunity to master the ancient models in their original setting, in a more abiding flavour than mere translations can give. Philosophers who are compelled to work backwards when they might have had the material harmoniously presented in a clearer perspective. Historians, biologists, legal investigators, orators, economists, architects, and even engineers!

Let us start with one of the most obvious applications of classics as the second-choice auxiliary to a young man's main selection or field of concentration. Suppose that he is preparing himself for Honours in History, or in Government, or in Economics. He should never take up such a programme without a knowledge of Thucydides—the best world-umpire of national motives. He should not lack familiarity with the essays of Tacitus on the Early

Germans (the Founders of England) and the government of Britain under Agricola. Some of Livy's Roman History, and something mediæval, like William of Malmesbury, would give him a continuity and a mastery of the analytic essence of history, without which modern material alone would be unintelligible and inadequate. The instructor, wisely considering the frontier of the boy's mind, would suggest other Latin readings also, correlated with courses in the major field of history. Numerous books on political institutions are available—the Greek city-state, the government of Rome. There is a rich offering of excellent modern volumes on those topics; and a high-class quarrel on the accuracy of Signor Gulielmo Ferrero is always worth starting! It is almost trite at this stage of the twentieth century to make reference to Benjamin Jowett and his embryo statesmen who discussed Plato's 'Republic' over the tea-cups. Even Henry Clay of Kentucky found that success in American frontier law and politics was aided by a wide reading of such ancient authorities, if only in translation. And a glance through the reading of Harrington, Burke, Bolingbroke, John Adams, Madison, and Jefferson, will prove the point.

Law and Latin went hand-in-hand, both for purposes of style and content, well into the nineteenth century. And the power of a lawyer, though now not dependent upon sonorous periods, is enhanced by the knowledge of the phraseology, the legal maxims, and the technical dicta of the 'Institutes,' in their original setting. Justinian, in Moyle's edition, repays a careful reading; and if this is too complicated or advanced, an easy stride through a more elementary handbook will give the economist or the future lawyer experience of the greatest value.

While we are not confronting the same *type* of crisis which previous periods of world-history have revealed, it is a sociological and community problem that we face; and here this reconciliation of ancient with modern can be of real assistance. We have had dinned into our ears the statement that over the past three centuries religious, political, and economic freedom in that order have been the leading issues. We do not realise how much the changes in religious attitude were based upon classical parallels, from the defenders of the established Church to the rebels of the seventeenth century, from the previously

mentioned William Penn to his arch-enemy Cotton Mather, from the remorseless logic of Jonathan Edwards to the easy illustrations of Benjamin Franklin. We should understand to what extent the doctrines expressed by Thucydides, Livy, the Stoics, Cicero, Aristotle, were consciously woven into the fabric of early instruments of government. One also suspects that a cogent reason for the classical revival in Florentine Italy and Elizabethan England was the application of its doctrines to their successful trade developments and their far-flung geographic explorations: the rôle of the ancient heroes was easily transferable to the *crescendo* glory of these rising nations—Athenian naval supremacy, the Roman control of the Mediterranean, 'and all that.' The humanists of the Renaissance did not limit their philological learning to the isolated study of classical antiquity, but applied this learning to daily life. The student of Pliny the Elder made collections of natural history for purposes of comparison. Ancient geography and history were the pattern for contemporary chronicles, even when composed in Italian. Latin drama was produced and stage-managed by these humanists, literature was used as a style-model and a creative living inspiration. A direct study of all these forces would produce in the intelligent student a familiarity with the trends which have led up to his contemporary situation.

There are many fields of knowledge where Latin is prescribed as a preliminary for those who would master their subject thoroughly. Skill in reading this language is a prerequisite for Romance languages and English. This being the case, why cannot co-operation exist for the sake of familiarising the student with Roman comedy in the original, and with the tragedies of Seneca which have had such influence upon Elizabethan drama? How can a French student understand Corneille and Racine without going to the originals whence much of this material is derived? Or Molière without knowing where he got his 'Scapin' and 'L'Avare'? Or at least read concurrently, if it is too late to dig out the secrets of the most beautiful language in the world, the translations of some Greek dramatists? English 'character-writing' owes much to Theophrastus; French fables, as in La Fontaine, hark back to Phædrus. There is the impressive army of great

epics, inviting comparison. And who can understand philosophy adequately without a first-hand familiarity with Aristotle and Plato, the Ciceronian dialogues which have popularised the arguments for Stoicism, Epicureanism, the Academics, and so on into the mediæval predecessors of the Schoolmen? Or what would a discussion of the lyric type of poetry be without Horace, Catullus, and at least a few of their Greek antecedents? One would welcome a course on the comparative literature, or 'Roving' idea, in which satire could be studied, working backwards from Byron to Pope to Boileau to the Horace-Juvenal classics and the invectives of Theognis and Archilochus. It is thus that boundaries may be broken down and the wide view of an Erasmus may be attained.

There are in first-class universities between twenty-five and thirty fields in which undergraduates concentrate. Of these there are, both in England and in the United States, five fields in which a reading knowledge of either Greek or Latin is required; in seven more it is recommended; and in at least four it is welcomed. The head of a distinguished American engineering school has recently stated publicly that he would like to start a twenty-ninth department—one in which classics and mechanics would be continuously and concurrently studied—in the proportion of one to four!

It will be remembered that just before the Revival of Learning, in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, according to Lynn Thorndike, science developed so vigorously that if the Church had not been so conservative, this type of laboratory experimental thought would have rivalled and possibly displaced the enthusiasm for things classical which formed the pabulum of Petrarch and Boccaccio. The humanists narrowly escaped being side-tracked in favour of the natural philosophers, from Roger Bacon to Galileo. The same process is now taking place in the twentieth century: laboratories are pushing libraries insistently. The thoughtful progressive wishes to see them functioning harmoniously, but he dreads the annihilation of the humanistic idea and the substitution of the test-tube or shop for the urbanity of the Tusculan Disputation. The economist and the technician, who have been elbowing the humanities and the cultural agencies off the map, must not be altogether blamed; it

is the exponent of culture, in view of the directionless movements of the machine age, who should restore the balance. The humanist, who has on various occasions re-set the compass for civilisation, should at this critical epoch seize his opportunity to direct progress in wise channels. If archæology can use Greek and Latin in practical combination with the contributions of excavation to museum interests and exhibits, why not engineering in its ancient form, or medicine, or any other aspect of man's creative science? It is time that Matthew Arnold's definition of *culture*—'knowledge of the best that has been thought and said in the world'—should be amended by E. B. Tylor's more up-to-date phrase—'that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.'

President Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, realises the existence of this need, and the failure of the humanities to redress the balance. He therefore sees in a more effectively taught science and in technological advancement a panacea for our ills. He is sound when he uses the radio to broadcast 'the establishment of a more favourable political situation in which the powerful forces of productive science and its trained technologists can join with the forces of capital and labour for their best achievements.' One cannot object to his accuracy or sincerity when he declares that 'the world will continue to depend upon scientific discoveries and their applications for its material progress and at least part of its social progress.' And here, as Dr Compton would admit, is the opening for the humanities—the *other* part of its social progress, the intellectual understanding and application of that which the technological expert has developed. This view has been supplemented by Mr Malcolm Cowley, who believes with the French poet Paul Valéry that some forms of literature will become obsolete and will die out because of our progress in applied science. We should see to it that only those forms disappear which have no relation either to technique or to thought. And the question naturally follows: 'Is there any part of the humanistic tradition that you and I cherish which is in danger of such obsolescence?' Well, let us see what material we may develop along these lines.

There is the great work of Vitruvius for the architect—a fascinating, rough-hewn set of memoranda put together by a practical engineer of the Augustan-Tiberian age. Sites for houses, methods of hauling drums, anecdotes of builders, all these dramatic bits are found in this ancestor of Palladio, Inigo Jones, Jefferson's Monticello and L'Enfant's designs for the Washington building programme. In view of the change in some architectural schools to a more definite idea of design at an earlier stage, and a lesser emphasis upon fine arts in the abstract, the Latin of this practical Roman, with collateral readings from later writers, will whet the appetite; thus the classics will mean more to such a pupil than the old-time hundred lines a day, pounded out painfully, measured meticulously, and bearing no relation to the main interest of the student.

Suppose a pre-medical biologist swims into our ken. He will profit by the reading of the Elder Pliny's 'Natural History,' Seneca's 'Researches in Physics,' the Bee-Poem of Vergil, the 'Bestiaries' of the Middle Ages, a translation from the Greek of Theophrastus 'On Plants,' and some modern commentary which will make the transition and the tradition clear.

Years ago a young tutor supervised a translation from the Roman physician Celsus, which represented the Englishing of over three hundred Teubner pages by an undergraduate who planned a medical career and is now a successful surgeon. They read together a translation of Galen, and studied superficially some of the history of his medical ideas and the extravagant influence of his theory of 'humours.' There is no pre-mastication, no regurgitation: what happens is that the interested student catches fire, and the uninterested undergraduate abandons the project—and properly so! The Latin tutor need not be an expert in biology; but he should treat his disciple as if he were about to become one, rather than a Latinist.

There would be no need for any 'favoured subject' clause in such a schedule. The topic becomes interesting in itself and not because of any prescription from the past. There is thus no duel between literary culture and laboratory science. Vitruvius by himself is seldom read; the old practical architect, however, with his quaint and crude Latin, becomes inspiring in company with modern

design; the physicians, Celsus and Galen, produce a similar joy in collaboration, where the original ancients would be in themselves objects of neglect.

Perhaps enough has been said to indicate the nature of this 'applied' or auxiliary method in which Latin, and whenever possible, Greek, may be a real aid to the primary study of drama, or economics, or history, or science, or literature, or what you will. The ancient thus correlates itself with the modern in speculative, legal, artistic, or concrete forms of interest and activity. The ancient language may accomplish what it did at certain past stages of man's career—Charlemagne, the Elizabethan, the Age of Reason, the American Colonial experiment, and many others.

Let us in conclusion pull together a few threads which are really related to each other. First, the work must be thorough, and the reading done as in college tutorial conferences—whether singly, or in small groups who choose the same modern correlation. Second, the material must be transfused in its interpretation; for we should remember that if a mediæval minstrel were to sing to-day he would carol as Wolfram does in 'Tannhäuser' and not as we translate the actual Middle-High-German poetry of Wolfram or Walther von der Vogelweide. The setting has changed, and centuries have elapsed. Third, we must cure an old habit which Francis Bacon, Comenius, and Henry Adams have all condemned: in order to read Latin (let us take that language alone as an illustration, in view of the scarcity of pre-college Greek courses), we should cease to teach it in such lumbering and ultra-grammatical fashion in the early stages; and we ought to have a two-year rapid course in our colleges for those who have never had Latin before. If we can impart a respectable understanding of Greek in beginning college courses in a total of two years, why not Latin? Furthermore, whether in higher or secondary stages of learning, we can shorten the time for all good students without losing any of the essentials. Latin should be taught like a modern language, with more rapidity and for the primary purpose of reading ability. Five years is enough for its school time, two years for college mastery. At the end of this time the student should be ready to read simple Latin at sight. And lastly, there is a charm in roving,

in jumping boundaries. It is wholesome to realise that things refuse to be catalogued. In literature, for example, it is no longer correct to babble about classicism and romanticism as opposite polarities. Wise critics have proved that their ingredients are blended. The Noble Savage motif in eighteenth-century literature came, like pastoral poetry, more largely from Theocritus and Ovid and the isle of Atlantis than it did from Rousseau. John Stuart Mill's radical philosophy had its roots in ancient sources, as any reader of his biography will find; Ferdinand Lassalle, one of the founders of Socialism, used classical education as the reform agency for the bourgeois economics of his day. And as to Nietzsche, it is only necessary to name Apollo and Dionysus. Fourteenthly, Woodrow Wilson's phrase about 'making the humanities human' was bound up with his ideal of the League of Nations and the greater respect for human nature. Astonishingly enough, William Butler Yeats and Ezra Pound, talking and walking at Rapallo, discussed Pound's proposed masterpiece: 'One hundred cantos—containing but two themes, the Descent into Hades from Homer, a Metamorphosis from Ovid, and, mixed with these, mediæval or modern historical characters.'

There is a delight in what Horace Walpole called 'Serendipity': the bibliophile's search for one thing and the finding of another equally good. This is a superior quality to the Serenity which ultimately will wear its statuesque smile at the bottom of some ash-dump in the Brave New World which our modernists are planning. And if we adherents of the classics do not wake to a realisation of modern trends which must somehow be met and not ignored, we might as well migrate to some other type of work, or to some Elysium where we dwell solely upon the happy past.

RICHARD M. GUMMERE  
of Cambridge, Massachusetts.

## Art. 4.—THE SPENS REPORT.

NEARLY five hundred closely printed pages represent the consensus of opinion of twenty-one members of the Consultative Committee set up in 1933 by the Board of Education

‘ to consider and report upon the organisation and interrelation of schools, other than those administered under the Elementary Code, which provide education for pupils beyond the age of 11 ; regard being had in particular to the framework and content of the education of pupils who do not remain at school beyond the age of about 16.’

The full committee sat on seventy-four days and examined one hundred and fifty witnesses. Sub-committees sat on thirty-six days and heard twenty-two witnesses. Nearly five hundred persons and organisations submitted memoranda and other data for the use of the Consultative Committee. Mr (now Sir) Will Spens, Master of Corpus Christi, Cambridge, was chairman of this committee throughout the whole period of its sitting.

It became clear, as a result of the famous Report on the Education of the Adolescent, published in 1926, that what is generally termed ‘ post-primary ’ education was moving in its philosophy if not in its organisation towards a unified system, as far as municipal schools were concerned, for the education of children from about 11 upwards to the highest school leaving ages, which in some cases might be as high as 18 years. Thus, the Hadow Report made inevitable the raising of the school-leaving age for compulsory education to 15 years, since provided for, with exemptions, by the Education Act, 1936. It is evident that this will in time become 16, and this probability, indeed necessity, has been kept in mind in the Spens Report. Thus, taking the long view, post-primary education has to have regard for two groups of children : those who will remain for the shorter course up to 16 years and those who will remain until about 18 in advanced courses or in the ‘ sixth form ’ until they are claimed by the universities, the learned professions, and the higher branches of industry and commerce.

The Consultative Committee therefore found it essential to depart somewhat from the strict interpretation of the terms of reference and to include within consideration

children who *remained* at school well beyond the age of about 16. No committee considering secondary education could have done otherwise, nor could they have omitted the discussion of the new senior, central, or 'modern' schools which have and are being set up for 11 plus children under the Elementary Code. The Report therefore surveys the whole field of post-primary education and ventures upon recommendations which are, strictly, outside the terms of reference. This is sound common sense inherent in the British way of doing things.

There is first an admirable sketch of the development of the traditional curriculum in secondary schools of different types in England and Wales. The endowed grammar schools for some hundreds of years prior to the middle of the eighteenth century were the typical schools of England and Wales. Their purpose was to teach in the main Latin and 'Latin Grammar' and to prepare their limited number of pupils to be 'artist scholars' of Oxford and Cambridge. William of Wykeham in his foundation deed for Winchester College states that it was to consist of 'seventy poor and needy scholars, clerks living college-wise in the same, studying and becoming proficient in grammaticals or the art, faculty or science of grammar.' The Report shows how this 'clerkly' kind of purpose of the grammar schools has ever since affected profoundly the outlook and curricula of our 'intermediate' and secondary schools, so that to-day, in the opinion of the Consultative Committee, much of secondary education has ceased to be related to modern conditions of living. Yet, curiously, later they advocate the separation of such schools from technological education! They use the argument, amongst others, that the grammar schools themselves were vocational in their purpose, that is, the preparation of young men for the law and for the Church. They then proceed to argue that we are justified in giving our schools to-day a new vocational turn to fit their pupils to the needs of modern life, having regard for the few, in comparison, who proceed to the universities from our secondary schools. The Report thus is a swing of the pendulum away from the old conception of a liberal education, although it argues, and rightly, that vocational studies, properly related and treated, can result in the acquisition of culture.

There is next a valuable chapter dealing with the more salient features in the physical and mental development of children between the ages of 11 and 16 years. This discusses the physiological as well as the psychological factors affecting the growth of the adolescent. A proper emphasis is laid in the Report on the importance of emotional reactions and characteristics in the sum total of education. This is to be welcomed, since we live in a world in which intellectual and scientific achievements have outstripped greatly the development of human emotions in the direction which would permit the use of the new scientific discoveries for the general well-being.

The 'faculty' development theory of education comes in for an analysis of its validity. It was believed, even in Edwardian days, for instance, that accuracy in mathematics made for unbiassed thinking and truth even in politics! We know better to-day, and that transfer of improvement in one study can only take place to another activity to a limited extent, and even then only when the different activities have certain general factors in common. As the report states, 'transfer of training appears, to put it cautiously, to be much less certain and of much narrower spread than was once believed.' There appears to be only one important omission in this admirable section of the Report, and that is, a long-overdue discussion on scientific lines of the question of co-education.

Then follows a discussion of the curriculum of the grammar school and of the secondary schools in general. It seems that the term 'grammar school' is being used by the Consultative Committee, at this stage, to describe not only schools of the old endowed type, but all schools of secondary status having an academic rather than a technical bias and aiming mainly to prepare their pupils for the universities. 'Creative' and 'conservative' types of children are visualised and the need for a full development of the powers of the individual within the social group is emphasised. 'It is necessary,' says the Report, 'to cater for the needs of children who are entering and passing through the stage of adolescence, giving the pre-adolescent and adolescent years a life which answers to their special needs and brings out their special values.' Again, 'the curriculum is to be thought of in

terms of activity and experience rather than of knowledge to be acquired and facts to be stored.' Also school studies should be brought into closer relation and contact with the practical affairs of life. Tutorial methods are advocated and the inclusion of 'Careers Masters' on the staffs of large schools is suggested.

One welcome feature is contained in the recommendation that the English language and its literature should become the core of the curriculum and the unifying principle in the teaching. This is a healthy reaction to the older 'genteel' notions of what is meant by education, and the birthright of the English people is thus to be restored to them in the schools. Mathematics should be taught as a *creative* subject with its aspects of arithmetic, geometry, algebra, etc., interwoven with each other rather than separated pedantically in the teaching. The romance of mathematics in the human story and its application to the interpretation of experience and in the development of mechanical constructions is to be shown so that this 'dry as dust' subject, as often taught, can be shown to be the fascinating adventure it really is. Even so, less time need be given to it except for the specialists or those who display exceptional ability and interest in the study.

Foreign languages also are soundly apprised as to their value in a reasonable system of education. All pupils should be given the opportunity of learning, on the intensive principle at first, at least one foreign language, but those who show no linguistic gifts or interests should be allowed to drop its study. Those who show linguistic aptitudes are to be encouraged to develop them and to study more than one modern language. The place of the classics in the secondary schools is shown statistically by the facts that at the School Certificate Examination less than 3.5 per cent. offered Greek as compared with 41.5 per cent. offering Latin and 95.5 per cent. offering French. It is advocated that Latin should be 'so taught that something definite is gained by the pupils who do not continue after the age of 16.' The need to treat of the life and culture of Latin and Greek peoples, their myths and ideology, their historical and geographical backgrounds is brought out clearly and will serve to brighten the lives of many a schoolboy who otherwise would begin

the study by the mere learning, *in vacuo*, of dry declensions and stuffy conjugations.

Science, similarly, comes in for the same humanising influence. It should be approached not from the logical but the psychological angle—it must deal with the pupil's own experience, extend through interest his horizon . . . The teaching of science has lost close touch with life itself and, for this reason, has often failed either to give the knowledge required or to stimulate the pupil's interest.' The Report points out that the common practice of concentrating from the beginning, in the teaching of science, on the systematic study of particular sciences lays too early a stress on abstract theory and too little on the earlier phases of 'romance' and 'utility.' The historical and environmental approach is convincingly advocated, as well as the social and educational value of a study of biology.

It is natural that the recent emphasis on physical education has its counterpart in the developments advocated in this Report, as also the greater understanding in teachers to-day of the emotional and cultural value of the creative and æsthetic subjects like music and art in the cultivation of good mental health and a joy in living in our children. Both creative activity and appreciation are advocated in this connection.

Scripture should be taught, says the Report, mainly with the aim of understanding what the various books of the Bible were in fact intended to mean to the original readers. The place of the Jewish people and their literature in the story of the nations comes in obviously as part of this work.

The Consultative Committee believe that towards the end of school life there should be a deliberate turning of the training towards the vocations of life. It is clear that this can only be done in a general way except perhaps in commerce. The Report rightly distinguishes between education for commerce and commercial education. The time-table should not be crowded out with periods of formal instruction, and this will give opportunity for those even more valuable informal activities and contacts in a school. The recommendations as to homework follow closely those set out in the recently published Board of Education Report on the question. Children

under 11 are to be excused and the homework then graduated to suit the ages of the older children. No extra homework is to be set for week-ends and there must be safeguards to ensure proper co-ordination of the amount, as allocated by the different subject teachers, so as to prevent overloading. The corporate life of the school, whilst needing organisation, should not be over-organised, and much of this should be left to the pupils.

There is a separate treatment of the problems of country grammar schools and of schools in Wales. The full use of the rural environment should be made to supply the material of 'reality' teaching, and these schools are encouraged to develop definite horticultural and agricultural 'sides,' with also the systematic study of live-stock such as befitting a school. Farms in connection with country grammar schools are visualised—and, we might add, why not linked also with the town schools, who really need them even more? An especially welcome suggestion is that advocating the fuller and more frequent use of local surveys and the bringing into these of practical applications of arithmetic and geometry, general science, history, and geography. The importance of mechanical transport and power in relation to farms and, for the girls, the preservation of farm produce is brought out clearly in relation to the country grammar schools.

The special position of the Welsh 'intermediate' schools, situated often in small country towns, is considered in relation to Hadow reorganisation of the elementary schools. The welcome suggestion is made that these schools, although secondary in status, could quite well be the nuclei of all the post-primary education in the area grouped into one institution. This is the multilateral school in its complete form, and it follows to some extent the Scottish plan. Yet in their general recommendations the Consultative Committee have fought shy of the multilateral schools as applied to the more populous areas. Their arguments seem to be more expedient than convincing in principle. The use of the Welsh language, the adequate supply of books in both English and Welsh and greater attention to arts and crafts, speech training, dramatic art, and music in Welsh intermediate and secondary schools are advocated, along with special attention to the history and literature of the Welsh people. The

Welshmen on the Committee have seen to it that the special needs of the Principality were not forgotten.

At last in an official report comes welcome recommendations for the overdue reform of the School Certificate Examination. It is true that, at its inception, it was intended that the examination should follow and not control the curriculum, yet in practice it has tended to stereotype syllabuses and to make for too much formality and uniformity. The School Certificate, being regarded as a qualification both for university matriculation (possibly) and by employers, has resulted in a tendency for the examination to cause anxieties and overstrain in sensitive adolescent pupils. The suggestion now made is that the School Certificate should be a first condition of matriculation, but matriculation should not be obtainable by this examination only. This means that candidates entering upon a degree course would be required to sit a further examination, certainly in some subjects, before they could matriculate. This, it is believed, will limit the tendency to regard a matriculation certificate as a qualification in itself divorced from any aim of university education to follow. Undue specialisation is to be discouraged and a reduction with advantage can be made in the content of the examination syllabuses. This will enable a wider choice of subjects to be made and passes in at least five required, these subjects being entered on the certificate and not only the credits, as at present. Candidates should be required to pass in English and either in a foreign language or in some scientific subject, including mathematics; but, apart from this, full freedom of choice should be exercised.

The Report is clearly out to develop the technical and vocational side of higher education rather than the academic values as now represented in the secondary or grammar schools. The Committee have here come into line with Circular 1464 of the Board of Education issued last year, which called a halt on the provision of new secondary schools. For the grammar schools, with a leaving age of 18 plus visualised, 15 per cent. of our pupils at 11 plus are to be selected, then there will be a second 'creaming off' for the technical schools of various kinds with a leaving age of 16 plus or thereabouts and the allocation of the remainder of the children to 'modern'

schools, now represented by the non-selective central or senior school with a leaving age, with exemptions, as from September 1939 of 15 plus. Later, the report visualises the leaving age even for these 'modern' schools to become 16. The name 'modern' appears to be unfortunate, as it can have no meaning when these schools develop a history and a tradition. New College, Oxford, established centuries ago, is still called 'New.'

There seems to be no discussion as to the special character of the London Central Schools, which are selective in type and provide a curriculum which is practically that of a short-period secondary school preparing pupils for a School Certificate, often with a bias towards commercial education. Although operating under the Elementary Code, these schools are virtually secondary schools, and it seems to be tacitly assumed that they will fit into the new schools of technical type or become recognised 'grammar' schools.

The high spot of the Report is therefore its advocacy of a new type of school, which, it is hoped, is to have 'parity' in its own sphere with the grammar or old secondary school in another. The age of admission is to be similar—that is, 11 plus—and the curriculum is to be largely similar in the early stages to that of the lower forms of secondary schools, and in the later stages to become more vocational in the direction of technology. This type of school may be in addition to or developed from existing junior technical or day technical schools, which now have an age entry of about 13 plus with a short course of two or three years of a combined cultural and vocational—technical, commercial, and art—type.

Then all the three main groups of post-primary municipal schools—the grammar and secondary with academic aims and leaving age of 18 plus for the best pupils, the technical high schools with a vocational bias and leaving age of 16 plus in the main, and the 'modern' schools for the remainder of the children of the 11 plus group with a leaving age of 15 plus shortly and 16 plus ultimately—are to come under one Code of Regulations and be regarded as components of secondary or post-primary education with 'parity' in status and premises, except in so far as the latter are conditioned by the length of the course and the subject matter of the curriculum.

To ensure this new unity of post-primary education the report proposes a two-fold scale of salaries common to the teachers in such schools, these scales being related to establishments of 'higher' posts usually held by graduates and 'lower' posts held by both graduates and two-year trained and certificated teachers.

For the grammar schools there is visualised, it is understood, 70 per cent.; for the technical high schools, 70 per cent.; for selective 'modern' schools, 50 per cent.; and for the non-selective 'modern' schools 30 per cent. of the posts paid under the higher scales. Thus it is intended, through the Burnham Committee, to unify salary scales into one scheme for post-primary schools. It is difficult to see how parity is, in practice, to be obtained by this disparity of staffing as between school and school. If the bright pupil has to be taught the advanced stages of a subject, he is more easily taught than the dullard. Where the 'higher' teacher may have to know his subject better, the 'lower' teacher will need to know his psychology and teaching method better. There therefore appears little reason, qualifications being equal, why different scales should apply.

Then in the interests of the 'parity,' with which the Consultative Committee is laudably concerned, they propose that a departmental committee should examine the future of the education authorities who are autonomous only for the control of elementary education. These are the boroughs and urban districts with this right attributed to them under Part III of the Education Act of 1902. If these authorities, most of which have undertaken with great vigour and success the reorganisation of their elementary schools under the Hadow Report, are to lose the central or senior schools under the new 'parity,' they will be left with responsibility for the education only of children up to eleven years of age.

This would be an absurdity, and inevitably the lesser areas would be absorbed for educational purposes into that of the county, or they would acquire, through suitable delegation of powers, a measure of autonomy for all sections of education in a decentralised scheme. It would be a vast pity to lose in education the value of the age-old civic consciousness of the English town. The town is an organism in English public life, whilst the county is merely

an organisation of recent growth. Much would be lost if the towns were too drastically merged into the counties in the service of education. The amalgamation of several adjacent and small 'Part III' authorities so as to include some of the county area, thus forming a workable unit for education administration, would be a compromise in some cases between the two solutions which would be open if the recommendations of the Report are, in this respect, adopted.

That, apart from the excellent appendices, is the main outline of the picture set out by the Consultative Committee. It can be immediately granted that they have sincerely attempted to bring some ordered plan into the present chaos of post-primary education. They have, according to their lights, sought to obtain parity between the schools of this important stage. They have attempted to unify the teaching profession under one new 'Secondary Code' and one scheme of post-primary salaries. Their intentions have been praiseworthy, but can it be accepted that these proposals will, in practice, entirely succeed? It is extremely doubtful. To the already over-specialised post-primary schools the Consultative Committee propose to add another—the Technical High School. There is, in my view, already too much selectivity in the post-primary schools. I am convinced that there is only *one* way of securing parity at this stage, and that is by one type of multilateral school. The new school would add another cause to those making for cleavages in our society. I feel that a united, tolerant people is far more important to-day than increases in technology.

Owing to difficulties of an administrative character connected with the size of the schools, it may be expedient to group the short course children in central or 'modern' schools with a leaving age ultimately of 16 plus, but for secondary education, whether of academic or technical bias, the children should be in the same school if, in practice, parity, even for these, is to be achieved. I am perfectly certain in my own mind that even if I meant my son to take up technology or engineering, I should unhesitatingly choose for him up to the age of eighteen a school of the 'grammar' type, yet having a 'modern' side, and *not* the Technical High School. In spite of the objections to the multilateral secondary school set out in

the Report, there is a vast body of opinion amongst teachers that it is the only way in which parity can be effected for that age group of children and the problems involved in the cross-transfer of children from one type of instruction to another made soluble. It is simpler organisation and more economical to develop for the town or part of the town its own 'secondary,' 'grammar,' or 'high' school—call it what you will—with its academical and its modern sides in the same premises. Such a school should have a distinctive name, and appellations of administrative character would become unnecessary. It would just be So-and-So School, not 'technical' or 'secondary' or 'grammar.'

Whilst the regionalisation of the higher stages of technical education may be expedient, the regionalisation of secondary education and of sixth-form work is a profound mistake. There is an unnecessary and wasteful interchange of pupils in the districts, these congesting, often at busy times, the already overburdened transport system. The money spent on transport in the interests of what may be, in a technical sense, efficiency, if converted into loan charges on sites and buildings would represent valuable accessions of premises to the local school.

The social values of the local—and not regional—schools are vastly greater. They fit more easily into the civic consciousness of the town or area. They are more accessible to parents and they are schools in the full sense of the word, not highly specialised institutions designed to train one type for a life in industry or commerce. It may be replied that the New Technical High Schools would not be over-specialised and would provide also a cultural education. If so, then the less strong is the argument for their separation. We are told that the multilateral local school could not develop easily its sixth-form work. Surely even the technical side of a local school could develop its post School-Certificate education and retain the best pupils for sixth-form courses of that character also.

The Technical High Schools, as advocated, are not shown with any emphasis to have the work of preparing pupils in courses from 16 plus to 18 plus. A separate leaving certificate is visualised, and whilst this is to be accepted by the universities for matriculation purposes,

it is different from the grammar school leaving certificate. Here is another cause for loss of parity. If the School Certificate is widened in character, why not include the necessary subjects on the technological side and so meet also the needs of the technical schools?

Another recommendation in respect of the Technical High Schools which, in my view, will handicap their development as *schools* in the fullest sense of the word and prevent real parity with the grammar schools is the opinion that it is desirable that these schools should be housed in the technical colleges or institutes, the head being the head of a department under the principal of the college. This arrangement would not make for the free development essential to the school and there would often be a tendency to influence the schools in the interests of technology to the detriment of their cultural and social work. The principals of technical colleges are technologists and not, as a rule, suited to supervise a school in the usual sense. Another argument used against the multilateral secondary school in the Report is that academic standards would be lowered. Yet the same Report advocates the reduction in the content of the secondary curriculum and more free periods for social and personal activities. Even if the sixth forms in the local school might be small, the use of the staff, having regard to the informal periods advocated in the Report, need not, in point of fact, be wasteful.

The whole plan of the Technical High School, attached to the technical college, with emphasis on a leaving age of 16 years, tends to give colour to the criticism that it is intended to deflect 'the rising tide' from the secondary schools—or perhaps to restrain 'the rising tide' from the secondary schools—from flooding that market long the perquisite of 'the old school tie.' It seems that a wholesale deflection of the secondary-school type of pupil into technological channels is being deliberately organised. There is insufficient emphasis in the Report of the Technical High Schools being also encouraged to prepare their pupils for technological courses in the universities.

The value of the local school of multilateral type from the social point of view is vastly greater than a diversity of schools of special types within a region. The diversity

should be attained within the school, not by a diversity of schools. The introduction of a practical 'side' into the secondary school would benefit the academic 'side' through contact with realities, and, conversely, the academic side would make its contribution to the technicians. We suffer more from an over supply of technology in the world than an over supply of liberal education. If it be answered that the grammar schools are intended to provide entrants for the universities, etc., on the showing of the Report itself, it is clear that even in these schools the majority do not reach the universities. The argument surely is that if the secondary and grammar schools prepare their pupils for life more generally in actual practice, surely the addition of technology in 'modern sides' to these schools is the reasonable way.

Therefore, though this monumental Report has many good things, it appears to me that, whilst the educationists have spoken well on the content of education, the administrators have missed an opportunity for advocating a greater simplification of schools for children from 11 plus to 16 and 18 plus. Instead of a spiritual solution they have offered one manufactured at an office desk. Had they advocated one type of High Schools with variety within them, they would have begun a new epoch in education which would be more liberal in character than this specialised preparation for a technological age which does not know what to do with the vast products of its own technology.

Such suspicions as these must be present in the minds of many readers of this Report, for whilst they have praised, it has in some ways been faint praise. Five hundred pages is impressive and five years' work ought to be good, yet, like Mr Ramsay MacDonald in a famous phrase, one feels like saying, 'I admit the logic of the argument, but yet I *feel* it to be wrong.' There is something of the corporate state idea in this over-early selection of children for different work in the world, and democracy must look more closely into the mouth of this gift horse, even though it advocates one hundred per cent. special places in those schools which are to have, it is hoped, the status of secondary schools.

FREDERIC EVANS.

## Art. 5.—HISTORY AND DESTINY TO-DAY.

1. *The Modern Historian*. By C. H. Williams. Nelson, 1938.
2. *The Meaning of History*. By Nicolas Berdyaev. Bles, 1936.
3. *A Study of History, Volumes I-III*. By Arnold J. Toynbee. Oxford University Press for The Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1935.

THE word 'destiny' is one of the key words to unlock the door to the understanding of modern history. No single word plays a greater part in our contemporary world; and it is one of the major tragedies that a word which should suggest thoughts of serenity and resignation is everywhere being used to cloak brutality and to further war. When Italy was earning the moral condemnation of the rest of the world during her invasion of Abyssinia, she protested that she did but fulfil her destiny and she could do no other. Germany has constantly used the same plea. She invades Austria in defiance of some half-dozen sworn pledges, but her conduct in this, as in all else, is righteous, for she does but walk down the path which history has marked out for her. In the mouth of her leaders the phrase racial destiny has become virtually a synonym for the persecution of the Jews. Similarly, when a Japanese diplomat finds it necessary to cast a cloak of respectability over the conduct of her militarists, he almost invariably says that Japan invades China in fulfilment of her destiny. He is, moreover, perfectly sincere in believing that the weight of this plea is sufficient to overturn the charges of Western moralists. To him it is no humbug. Every patriotic Japanese believes that history has laid upon Japan the destiny of leading Asia, if not the whole world, in pursuit of the things which belong to human peace. It is an integral part of her religion, and how is she blameworthy for merely seeking to fulfil the office which the inexorable fates have appointed for her? If others choose to resist, theirs is the blame. Karl Marx is also full of such teachings. The working class is the destined rising class, as the ruling or capitalist class is destined to fall. If the pursuit of this destiny involves the use of weapons of cruelty

against the enemies of the revolution, it is the capitalists who are to be blamed, and their condemnation consists in this—that they have so misread history as not to perceive the fate it has pronounced on them and their like.

The sinister associations which thus surround the word 'destiny' shed a new light on the vehemence with which Christianity has always repudiated every fatalistic explanation of the riddles of life. Destiny, as the totalitarians regard it, is only fatalism under another and rather more respectable name, and fatalism is as much of an explosive as an anodyne. Dictatorship needs both qualities; an anodyne to drug into a stupor the questing mind and critical spirit, and an explosive to cause its people to spend themselves in a fine and idealist frenzy without any let or hindrance of moral dubieties. The idea of the historical destiny fills both needs. The scruples of those who by nature are decent and kindly, when they are ordered to perform some utterly disgraceful duty, can best be laid to rest if they can be transferred on to the back of some impersonal or imponderable force. The historical destiny of the class, the race, or the nation is that force. It is so easy to put the blame on history, and one can be certain that history will not answer back. By a piece of inverted reasoning, it is even possible to argue that such a mental process is a testimony to the reality and force of moral principles. To shell Almeria, to bomb Canton—it is possible to refrain from saying that these acts are morally right, even to regret them as morally wrong, and still to be quite sure they will be enthusiastically done, provided that the idea of destiny can be accepted as the moral scapegoat. Such language may sound cloudy, but it describes a reality grim and practical. How else can we account for the hideous things which are being done day by day by quite ordinary and decent young people?

Destiny is the dialectical line which history lays down. To misread history, to make a false analysis of its facts has become the sin against fatalism for which there is no forgiveness. This, for example, is fundamentally the offence of Trotsky. Many are, none the less, found to take in hand the dangerous task of interpreting history, and elucidating national and class destinies therefrom. A demand always begets a supply: it is as true of

academic philosophers as economic commodities. The demand of the newer nationalisms for interpreters of history is both urgent and steady. Hardly ever before has the interpreter of history enjoyed such a hey-day. Never has his calling been held in such high honour. He is at once both the prophet and the priest of the dictatorships. He charts their course, he marks their bounds, and he is in a very real sense the guardian of their morals. 'That is moral which serves the destiny of the working class'—or the nation. The phrase may make us shudder. That it does not make the subject of a dictatorship shudder is due to the fact that the interpreter of history, the Court Astrologer of the twentieth century, has himself made it inevitable, and made of history the scapegoat to take upon its shoulders the sins of us all.

The vital quality to be sought in aspirants to the office of historical interpreter-in-ordinary is faith. A deep knowledge of history is quite secondary, and in fact is quite seldom found. But dictatorships live on faith precisely because they are fundamentally religious movements, and they demand of their historical interpreters not only that they should themselves be men of faith, but also that they should be able to create it in others. 'A miracle is an event which creates faith,' said Bernard Shaw in a famous aphorism. So it may be, but as we have learned to our cost, faith does not need a miracle to create it. A faith in a destiny, entertained in such a universal passion of blind, sacrificial enthusiasm as to invest it with the driving force of Leviathan, can be sustained and, in a sense, created by an event so unmiraculous and pedestrian as the research of a shabby old man with white whiskers in the British museum or the effort of a thoroughly obscure university professor in Vienna to explain why Austria had come to the horrible miseries of 1919, and what could be done about it. Neither Karl Marx nor Othmar Spann looked anything more than thoroughly academic historical philosophers, and that indeed is what they were. But they had the gift of creating faith, of proposing a class or national destiny which could be popularised. More than any other pair of men they have created the mental climate of the world in which we have to live. And so with all the other academic interpreters of history, whose works

are accounted inspired by one dictatorship or another, Klages, Rosenberg, Houston Chamberlain, and Sorel. They were all portents which created faith.

This was partly because, being interpreters of history, they had faith themselves. He who seeks to wrest the meaning of history from the record of the past must assume that history is purposive. In the nature of things, many, if not most of the facts of history, must elude his consciousness, but he must not allow this to deter him from asserting that the human story possesses meaning. He must pursue his quest undeterred by the fact that by far the greatest part of the human story has not yet taken place. Having only the prologue of the drama before him, he must none the less believe it possible to discover from this rudimentary fragment a rhythm, a purpose, a theory of destiny which will give significance alike to the prologue and to all the acts yet to come. Every one of these is a venture of faith, and without faith no interpretation of history, however tentative, can be undertaken. That most of us neither admit nor approve what the academic philosophers of totalitarianism make of it all does not in the least deny that they are men possessing a faith so strong as to engender faith in others.

The Christian who thinks is likely to be a rather puzzled observer of these phenomena. The more he abhors the practical results of this yielding to the idea of historical destiny, the more he is bound to recognise that these ideas at least resemble his own. He too lives in a destined world, and traces the outlines of this destiny from his venture of interpreting history. He believes that the world is foreordained to be the scene and history of the record of God's triumph over evil. Thus, just like the Marxist and the Fascist, he has that which keeps him serenely confident at times when his righteousness seems everywhere in defeat. God is not mocked and His will is eventually done. It lies with us only to hinder or to hasten the day, but not to alter it. To-day the Christian faces the possibility that his religion may wholly disappear from Europe, and his reaction is only to look to the East, to India and China, the true centre of gravity of Christendom to-day, and confidently expect failure in one part of the world to be matched by success in another.

Yet there are, of course, vital differences. It is true

that the Christian is as much concerned with the interpretation of history as the philosophers of the new authoritarian paganism, and true again that he approaches his task with a set of preconceived ideas which are at least related to theirs. But, of course, he gets out of history a theory of life which is different. To the authoritarian, destiny is a fate to be worked out in full cycle, not only within the limits of the space-time world but also within the limits of foreseeable time. The Christian, on the other hand, proposes for the world a final destiny which is tied to the human vision of God and to the ideal of affording to God the ultimate creative satisfaction of rejoicing in the perfecting of the world which He made. In the nature of things that destiny can never be totally fulfilled within the limits of the space-time world. The ultimate goal of progress is, therefore, transferred to the realm of eternal verities, and it is what the Christian makes of history that transfers it there.

Similarly, to the Christian that is a true interpretation of history which tends most toward the liberating of most men and a false interpretation which tends to enslave them. History for the Christian turns upon a single pivot, the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, an event taking place itself within the historical scheme of things. That event can have no meaning unless a part of it is what the great philosopher, Berdyaev, disclosed, that God does not merely endow men with freedom, but goes further and actually demands freedom from them at every stage of their discipleship. The theory of history in which the life of Jesus Christ is seen to be crucial and pivotal is one which can only be denied and distorted by an effort to cramp human freedom and to stifle human personality. These are vital differences indeed, and they place the Christian and the totalitarian philosophers of history on two sides of a sharp line of division. The fact that they may show certain traits in common and start together from the idea of destiny does not blur that line of division. It is absolute and fundamental, and between the two there can be no accommodation.

But, as the statesmen are never tired of telling us, some means of accommodation must be found. The philosophers are fundamentally opposed. What of the historians proper, of whom nothing has yet been said?

Those who draw out of history a fate or a destiny are, for the most part, men like Rosenberg and Karl Marx, while the Christian interpreters were yesterday men like St Paul and St Augustine, a little later Calvin, and to-day Nicolas Berdyaev. None of these are historians proper; they are all either philosophers or theologians, who have had to learn some history in order to provide themselves with the raw material of their proper study. The historians themselves, however, are apt to keep silence about the meaning of their craft. One of the most distinguished is, in fact, quite despairing. Professor H. A. L. Fisher began his great work, the three-volume 'History of Europe,' with the remark, 'Many wiser and more learned than I have discovered in history a plot, a rhythm, a predetermined pattern, these harmonies are concealed from me': in other words, here is a great historian proclaiming that historical interpretation can never be more than guesswork. Happily, few historians are so despairing. But the testimony of Professor C. H. Williams' recent anthology of the work of modern historians, called 'Modern Historians,' tells much the same tale. Few have stepped aside from their narrative to speculate on what that narrative means. They seem to interpret their task as a duty to tell a story, to say what things happened and how, why, and when. It is but rarely that they set themselves the further and still more interesting question, 'What do these happenings together mean for human life?' The historians Professor Williams levies under contribution do, indeed, discuss the technique of their trade, but when they do so, they are for the most part contented to argue as to whether history is a science or an art, to defend or attack the increasing fashion of spending one's whole life in illuminating a minute corner of the whole historical field. They are seen using moral or political insights as a means of getting their material in order, and as a principle of selection from the mass of facts which their industry had unearthed. Lord Acton, to whom all historians readily pay tribute, uses his moral insight for that purpose: 'I exhort you never to debase the moral currency or to lower the standards of rectitude, but to try events by the final maxims that govern your own lives and to suffer no man and no cause to escape the undying penalty which history has the power to inflict

upon wrong.' This thought we may couple with his famous aphorism, which every day's newspaper makes increasingly plain, 'Power Corrupts, Absolute Power Corrupts Absolutely.' That is to use a moral insight as a principle of selection. His predecessor in the Chair of History at Cambridge, Sir John Seely, used a political insight for the same purpose. To him, history was a complicated story which concealed at its heart one plot and one climax, the preparing of the ground for the British Empire and the imperial achievement of Britain. There are, naturally, many exceptions, but the main impression one gets from reading Professor Williams' anthology is that historians as a body have rather rigidly confined themselves to their proper business, the assembling and weighing of evidence and the telling of a tale. But the academic philosophers use history as a means of explaining the trend of life in general and of indicating the kind of goals to which life is moving. They regard the historians proper as their servants and, as we have seen, they get out of the same set of facts a variety of goals, destinies, and fates which are quite bewildering.

This is really an impasse. It is the riddle of destiny which we are examining. The authoritarian use of the term is seen to lead in practice to all kinds of fraud, violence, and cruelty. The Christian use of the term is believed to lead away from them, but is always open to the charge of an utterly uninfluential vagueness, and rests its authority upon a miraculous fact in history which it needs faith to accept. The two views, dispassionately judged, cancel out. The professional historians do not help us to come to a decision about this crucial question of destiny. They present us with our raw materials and tell us to go and think it out again. If we are to escape from the dilemma, we find some new approach.

The new approach is through Professor Arnold Toynbee's masterpiece 'The Study of History.' It is he who can set our feet in a new and fruitful path. If one were asked which of the books of the last ten years is likely to be regarded in the future as the greatest literary monument of our day, this is the work one might name. As yet only the first three of the thirteen promised volumes are published. These are quite enough to show that our tortured generation has produced a veritable masterpiece

of historical interpretation, written by one who is before all things a historian. His range of knowledge is so immense as to be daunting. He is equally at home among the ancient and rather obscure civilisations of Ceylon, China, and Easter Island as he is in fields more familiar to us all, ancient Greece and modern America. He does not follow the chronological method, he jumps, at first rather bewilderingly, between B.C. and A.D. and from one side of the world to another, but as one reads on, no doubt is left as to what the Professor is trying to do. He is trying to discover from a philosophical study of history in its many facets and scenes, what the immense story is all about. He, therefore, regards the objective facts from the point of view of one who indeed has forgotten more history than most of the rest of us have ever learned, but who is, none the less, consciously arguing neither as a historian nor a Christian, but as a scientific objective philosopher who has really mastered the raw material of his trade.

His purpose is, as has been said, to discover what the human story is all about and what is the primary urge behind all the suffering, all the glory, all the treachery, and all the heroism which make the stuff of the history books. His answer is unhesitating and swift: it is the struggle of men and women to create the civilisation of their dreams and to make of themselves the kind of individuals who can fitly be citizens of this perfected commonwealth. Civilisation is the hero of the piece. The Professor is too wary to define anywhere (at least in his first three volumes) precisely what he means by civilisation. But he leaves us in no doubt that it has little or nothing to do with mechanical contrivances, with comfort, or even with security. It is a quality of living and, as a social state, that condition which best guarantees to its citizens the freedom within which they may learn to live richly and with grace.

But he does not merely examine his theme in order to discern what its purpose is. He goes deeper and examines it in order to discover the conditions which make the approach to that purpose possible, and the circumstances which impel men to set out on a quest for civilisation which, in each of its stages, is in some degree agonising. History, he says, moves in a vast rhythm. There is first

of all the inertia of pre-history, inert precisely because we know little about it : if men had not been inert we should know more. That inertia is broken and in some form or another a challenge is offered to the innate laziness of men, which, because it involves tension and suffering, impels them to struggle to overcome it and thus, in their struggle to mount higher on the mountain of Parnassus than they were before the challenge came to them. Progress is, therefore, the result of discomfort and proceeds by a series of jerks. Humanity is woken up out of its long comfortable sleep and its aim is to find that couch higher up the mountain of civilisation where it can comfortably go to sleep again. Eventually it does so and, after another spell, there comes a new challenge to wake us all up again and force us to struggle still further. Progress is thus a painful thing. The professor isolates the time at which humanity received a special shock ; it is four thousand years before Christ, in some ways the most important date in history. Then something happened, no one can tell what, but men everywhere received some portentous shock which woke them up and set them on the march. Since that time mankind has put forth no less than twenty-one civilising efforts. To this all races but one in the world have made their contribution and that one, the negroid, has still time. The fret and the fever of an enforced wakefulness has never left human beings since that date six thousand years ago.

A primary conclusion at once emerges. If history has any meaning at all, then there is truly such a thing as destiny. That destiny is the perfected civilisation. If Professor Toynbee is right, and it would need uncommon hardihood to contradict him, it follows that the totalitarians have erred in supposing that this destiny is properly thought of as affecting the smaller groups of mankind, such as classes or nations. If destiny is towards civilisation, and if history is any guide at all to the condition of progress, the civilising destiny of mankind is to be thought of as the movement of groups much larger than nations or classes. It may be true that here and there there have been considerable civilising efforts involving a comparatively limited amount of people, as, for example, that of the Polynesian Society, but the normal, identifiable civilisation is a thing far wider than

any nation can compass. The group, for example, to which we ourselves belong, which is called generally 'the civilisation of the West,' is comprised of all those nations which derive their traditions from Greek thought, Roman law, and the Christian revelation. Its boundaries are no less than the whole of Western Europe, stretching out into the east so as to include Greece and far out into the west to include North America. From this we may see that it is nonsense to take history and build a case upon it which produces a destiny for Germany or for Italy, or for the working-class, which can only propose for other nations and classes within the same group the task of a slavish subservience to them. Whatever history may or may not mean, at least it cannot mean that.

Christian thought, however, still remains dissatisfied. There is, it will feel, something more to be said before Professor Toynbee can be considered to cast any light upon the specifically Christian forms of destiny. However, the Professor says it. He does so by going back on his tracks to ask the question, 'What woke the slumbering Colossus six thousand years ago?' Something must have happened. And since it was in the days before written records, it is virtually impossible to produce evidence as to what the event was which shook all men everywhere. This question Professor Toynbee turns round and round and cannot find the answer. If he cannot find it, it means that there is no answer that any man can find. He is, therefore, driven to assume some kind of spiritual intervention operating from and in the realm in which the Divine exists, and set in motion by the Divine dissatisfaction with His own created handiwork.

This is, of course, an assumption born of the inability to explain facts otherwise. Once, however, you have made it there is a very great deal of evidence that comes in to support it. It is the evidence of every religious mythology in the history of the world. Whether the mythology is a very primitive one, like the first chapter of Genesis or some of the stories of the Greek hero gods, or whether, on the other hand, it is a most subtle and profound legend, like the story of Job, its fundamentals are always the same. They suggest that God made the world and then, for some unexplained reason, evil entered

into it and caused the sleep of inertia. Then God, desiring that His creation should be the best that was possible for it, and perceiving that things were not going as He hoped, Himself descended from his watching throne and challenged the devil to mortal combat on the scene of God's creation, the world. The result of this Titanic conflict is naturally the extreme discomfort of all those who are onlookers, and when it begins, it is no longer possible for men and women to slumber in peace. So before it is possible to explain why men subject themselves to these agonies and terrors in their search for what is better, it is necessary to assume God. And, in exactly the same way, God has to be assumed as the goal of progress, or otherwise it could have none. If God appears, so to speak, at both ends of the scale of time, it is at least likely that He is reasonably to be sought at any moment in the course of it.

Hence, from Professor Toynbee's account we are led to the second conclusion. Destiny is real, but it is bound up with the action of God. He inspires man's search for it, and He is the rewarder of those that finish their course, and He only can sustain men as they march. Here is the Christian position profoundly reinforced, while the wrong and, in its results, damnable conception of destiny is condemned not by one who is suspect through writing and thinking as a Christian, but by the most detached and most expert of all living historical philosophers. He is led by a purely scientific and objective study of the facts to the Christian conception of life, in which religion and history build up each other.

In a day when the study of history is so profoundly influential, this is the really fruitful line of apologetic. It is to argue for the necessity of the Christian interpretation of life in such a way as not to demand faith first of all for its acceptance, and yet to retain the overshadowing category of mystery, the abandonment of which always makes nonsense of any scheme of the interpretation of history. Only thus can we still keep the conception of destiny, and purge it of the horrible crimes committed in its name.

ROGER LLOYD.

## Art. 6.—PLANNED NATIONAL ECONOMY.

1. *The Middle Way : A Study of the Problem of Economic and Social Progress in a Free and Democratic Society.* By Harold Macmillan, M.P. Macmillan, 1938.
2. *New Money for New Men.* By S. S. Metz. Macmillan, 1938.
3. *Debt (Private and Public, Good and Bad).* By Ernest J. P. Benn. Benn, 1938.

It is not surprising at a time like the present, when the economic and financial doctrines which held good in the nineteenth century seem no longer able to serve the needs of a rapidly changing world, that economists and politicians of all schools of thought should devote themselves to the discovery of some new system for the better regulation of industry and of finance, and for the conduct and distribution of trade. At a period in the world's history when man is succeeding by the application of the teachings of science in increasing greatly the natural production of the land and is continually devising artificial substitutes for many of his needs, it seems absurd to many thoughtful people that there should be 'poverty in the midst of plenty' and that millions of men and women should be vainly seeking for employment. In countries in which new social and political systems have been inaugurated, substituting some form or other of dictatorship for the democratic and parliamentary system of government for so long familiar to us in this country, private enterprise and trading for profit have either been abolished or extensively curtailed, and the State has assumed the control, or a partial control, of industry and of commerce. The results so far attained by the totalitarian States towards an improvement of the standard of living of their citizens and in finding them employment, other than in munition factories, is not such as to convince an impartial student of economics that the adoption of the financial and economic methods of Communism or of Nazism or of Fascism would improve the material welfare of the people of this country or do away with the social evils which admittedly exist. It is unlikely, therefore, that the most convinced Socialist politicians in Great Britain to-day would be prepared, even if the

opportunity were offered to them, to put into practice anything approaching the full economic policy of any one of the dictators who are now ruling in Europe. At the same time, nevertheless, the humanitarian tendencies, which are so noticeable in Great Britain at the present time, are urging men, whatever their political opinions may be, to try and discover some economic system by which wealth can be more evenly distributed and by which the periods of trade stagnation that lead to much of our unemployment may be avoided. There is a constant search, therefore, for some middle way between 'Cobdenism,' which, as Sir William Beveridge has expressed it, 'just does not happen,' and the system of 'the free competitive market' which, as a matter of fact, is no longer politically possible under a democratic system the Government of which is compelled by pressure of public opinion to supervise and to readjust the economic machinery whenever it is out of gear or appears to be no longer supplying the needs of the community. There is, as might be expected, a great divergence of opinion among reformers as to the new economic system which is to take the place of capitalism—indeed, there is probably a majority among them, in this country at any rate, who do not desire to abolish that system entirely—whose aim, in other words, is to reorganise it and to adapt it to meet modern requirements. 'Planned capitalism' is, for instance, the goal aimed at by Mr Macmillan and the school of thought to which he belongs:

'I am led to the conclusion,' he writes, 'that, for as far ahead as we can see, it is both possible and desirable to find a solution of our economic difficulties in a mixed system which combines state ownership, regulation, or control of certain aspects of economic activity with the drive and initiative of private enterprise in the realms of origination and expansion for which it is by general admission so admirably suited.'

Mr Metz, too, is a planner, although his proposals differ considerably in detail from those of Mr Macmillan. The 'New Order' will, in his opinion,

'provide the way for the gradual transfer of ownership of all permanent assets in the country to the nation as purely constructive lines and fully consistent with the greater efficiency and happiness of the individual, whilst retaining all that is

admirable and desirable of the capitalist structure. This result can, however, be attained only under capitalism inspired with a new spirit.'

Sir Ernest Benn, the other writer whose work is being considered in this article, on the other hand, whilst agreeing that all is not well with our present financial and economic policy, is strongly opposed to 'planning.' He considers that our present discontents are due not to the capitalist system, but to the increasing interference by the State with its machinery, and to the vast expenditure now lavished upon the social services, which he contends the country cannot afford.

Before considering in detail the contentions put forward in these three books, it may be as well to try and understand what is meant by planning, if for no other reason than because there is so much disagreement among planners themselves as to the meaning of the term. Some economists, as, for example, Sir William Beveridge and Mr Robbins, maintain that the present method of regulation of economic conditions by the pricing system is as much planning as the conscious control and direction of production and distribution by national authorities, and that the problem to-day, therefore, is not that of devising a plan but of superseding one plan by another. Other economists, however, describe the existing business system either as a 'planless economy,'\* or contend that the distinguishing feature of the price economy is that it knows no general economic plan and that, consequently, the real difference between the planned and the unplanned economy 'is not that human volition is absent from the latter, but that the scope of particular decisions is there more narrowly limited.'† Probably the narrower definition of planning is the more reasonable one, not only because this is undoubtedly the most usual sense of the word, but also because it seems somewhat inappropriate to apply such a word—which conveys an impression of conscious direction of activities for the attainment of some objective only attainable by the coordination of these activities—to a system which is largely dependent upon atavistic decisions made not for

---

\* 'Principles of Economic Planning,' by G. D. H. Cole, Chap. IV.

† 'Plan or no Plan,' by Mrs Wootton, p. 47.

the purpose of directing national production and distribution as a whole, but usually to satisfy individual wants, regardless of the effect of such procedure upon the national situation.

Since, then, planning—even if the above limitation of the term is accepted—presupposes the creation of some machinery through which the national economy can, to some extent at any rate, be consciously directed, it is advisable to consider briefly whether such a policy could be carried out without a radical change of the existing political system. Both Mr Macmillan and Mr Metz assume that this would be possible. The former ultimately bases the case for his proposed reconstruction on the grounds that only so can democracy be preserved; the latter hopes for the survival of parliamentary democracy, but considers that there is little chance of this without spiritual regeneration.

The majority of Socialists, on the other hand, maintain that planning without full State control is impossible. They agree that compulsion, which amounts to State control and presumably would be recognised as such, would be necessary in order to make *entrepreneurs* produce the quantity and kind of goods and services which planning would demand. To-day, nevertheless, there are many politicians belonging to the Conservative Party who deny that a planned economy is incompatible with parliamentary democracy, although it is open to doubt whether such a view can be justified. In the first place, there would be the practical difficulty in such a system of achieving that delicate distinction between those aspects of planning which are or which are not suitable for discussion and resolution in Parliament. If too great a latitude were given to the House of Commons, even the best-laid plan might be rendered ineffective by parts of it being altered as the result of parliamentary interference. Any such clash of opinion, even if it did not actually defeat the plan, would almost certainly cause delay, and hence probably confusion and loss, in the execution of the plan—which for success would have to form part of a continuous process of economic reconstruction. And yet, unless Parliament is to retain its authority and prestige, those who were responsible for the planning machinery would in effect become absolute

in their own sphere and the conception of popular control over the government of the country would become a thing of the past. It is this aspect of planning which is used to support the objection, so often urged against it, that no such economic system can be made to work effectively except under some form of dictatorship, either Communist or Fascist, and it is certainly open to doubt whether a pricing system which allowed consumer's choice could be compatible with a collectivist system of economic planning. Is it really possible, then, to combine a dictatorship over the purchases of consumers in every field with a system of parliamentary democracy?

Sir Ernest Benn, who, of course, is not a planner, would have no doubt as to how to answer this question. The general argument of his book is directed to show that the economic system to-day in this country is already choked up with restrictions of one sort or another, and that recovery and stability cannot be achieved unless these restrictions are relaxed. He contends that, largely as a result of economic national and political interference during the last twenty years, the efficacy of the money market has been very seriously impaired, and points out that before the War, when money was absolutely free, without any restrictions on its movements anywhere, the rate of interest always was a natural thing. It always represented exactly the figure which would ensure that the borrowers and the lenders balanced one another. With regard to the industrial system, he considers that had we possessed the wisdom 'to allow the capitalist class to function freely with all the scientific advantages of the twentieth century, as they did in the nineteenth century without such advantages, the general standard (of living) might have been immeasurably higher still.'

The particular concern of Sir Ernest Benn's book, however, is the subject of debt. He is of the opinion that as scientific borrowing and lending are essential in a modern economy, civilisation on its commercial side may be said to be founded on debt, and that debt is essential to it. Certain principles, nevertheless, must be observed if the debt structure is not to collapse. Good borrowing is always for capital purposes and capital purposes only, and a debt, therefore, if it is a good debt, must always have at the back of it the assets which constitute the

security for it. A debt, to be a good debt, must be self-liquidating. It is because he believes that these principles of good borrowing are no longer being observed in this country in the field of public debt that Sir Ernest is nervous of a financial collapse. He points to the fact that State borrowing has increased by nearly thirty times in twenty years, and that there is no longer any proper sense of public responsibility as regards debt, no one appearing to bother his head about this enormous burden of national indebtedness. The absence, too, of anything in the nature of personal responsibility about present-day public debt is a matter which depresses Sir Ernest Benn. In the case of private debt, a certain rate of interest is fixed, and the debtor, if he cannot pay it, has no alternative but to go bankrupt. The Government is in no such position and, in addition, is often able to lower the rate of interest which it has guaranteed to pay. This latter course has been adopted several times within recent years, notably the conversion of 5 per cent. War Loan in 1932, a financial arrangement which was facilitated by means of a veto upon foreign lending and a voluntary agreement given by issuing houses not to bring forward new issues of capital. The control of the money market exercised by the Treasury as a result of the establishment of the Exchange Equalisation Fund also meets with the disapproval of Sir Ernest, who complains that the Bank of England 'has for practical purposes almost gone out of business, and its beneficent control has been supplanted by a sinister mechanism which works, not for the benefit of the trade of the world, not with the object of keeping the course of money even, but with the deliberate purpose and almost the only purpose of facilitating the work and operations and machinations of governments.' The particular manifestation of this 'sinister mechanism,' which Sir Ernest Benn condemns, is the attempt made by the Government to maintain the cheap money policy in 1937, which it had instituted with such success in 1932, and he gives as an example of the policy in practice the rigging of the market for the Funding 2½-per cent. Loan (1952-5) which he suspects the Government carried out in 1936. His solution of the economic problem is to revive in the minds of the people a right conception of the nature and responsibilities of debt, to inaugurate

a period of rest and consolidation, and to refrain from incurring further debt ; and as some ' will still say that " something must be done " and as a sop to the craving for practical proposals ' to maintain taxation during this period of rest and reflection, up to the limits of endurance and to apply all surpluses to the reduction of debt.

It is not easy to criticise the views put forward by Sir Ernest Benn, because the reasoning upon which they are based is rarely expounded. He makes no attempt, for instance, to show why a policy of dear money should have been adopted in 1937 or in what way the position would have been affected by such a policy. He merely implies that this was the ' natural ' procedure to adopt and, therefore, that it should have been adopted. He does not trouble to explain whether what might have been a practicable policy in the past would have been equally practicable or desirable to-day. Apart from the special operations carried out in order to ensure the success of the War Loan Conversion, the Government wields now a large—indeed, a preponderating—influence in the money market, with the result that control of financial policy has largely passed from the Bank of England to the Treasury. This control is exercised, as Sir Ernest Benn points out, by (1) tap issues of Treasury bills, i.e. by purchase by government departments of the bills out of their loose balances ; and (2) by ensuring a favourable reception for long-term loans by the government departments selling their holdings of Treasury bills and buying up enough of the loan to ensure its success ; they then unload gradually to the public.

Sir Ernest Benn contends that this practice, the facts of which are not in dispute, is a wrong one and demoralises the market. But he acknowledges that the 1932 conversion and the subsequent cheap money policy were a great stimulus to trade, and were indeed largely responsible for the revival. His objection really, therefore, centres on the alleged continuance of the policy after a rise in interest rates should have been allowed. There is some foundation for this objection, chiefly because the enforcement of cheap money has meant a continued embargo on foreign lending and, therefore, has meant yet another obstacle in the way of the expansion of foreign trade. In this connection, however, the market tendency for rates

to rise has recently had more rope, and a gradual increase in the long-term interest rate started about December 1934, although during the last two years many outside factors affecting the money market have made this trend difficult to distinguish. But it is, nevertheless, illogical for Sir Ernest Benn to acknowledge the impetus given by government interference in 1932 and then to condemn interference in 1937 on the grounds that such interference is intrinsically undesirable. The policy followed may be condemned, but this does not necessarily mean that the machinery is at fault. If it is at fault, it should not have been brought into operation in 1932, but Sir Ernest Benn does not explain how a monetary policy pursued by the banking system on traditional lines would have been any more efficacious. It may be fairly said, therefore, that he has not really proved his point that government interference in the money market since 1932 has on the whole been harmful.

As regards general economic policy, Sir Ernest Benn is frankly an anti-restrictionist. He obviously would favour a return to nineteenth-century principles of government—'The Government was supposed to hold the ring, see fair play, and especially to provide for any of the victims or casualties of the competitive system.' Now, our conception of a 'casualty' has undoubtedly broadened during the last forty or fifty years, and the result has been that, apart from any tendency for the trade depressions to become more severe, the burden of succouring the casualties of the competitive system has increased considerably. It is unavoidable, therefore, that government interference should encroach farther into the national life. The Government cannot face with equanimity the prospect of rescuing at intervals large cargoes of casualties without trying to institute some measures calculated to assist or to compel the competitive system to reduce the number of its casualties. Whilst it must be admitted that these preventive measures have so far met with no great success, no one can deny that the succour received by the casualties has undoubtedly been much improved in quality since the War. But it must be recognised that such measures—preventive, curative, or ameliorative—do involve interference with the free play of economic forces. This may mean a diversion of resources to less

economically productive channels, but this is not necessarily a reason for the condemnation of such measures. Economic loss may well be outweighed by social gain. It seems somewhat futile, therefore, whilst admitting that the State should assist in the maintenance of the unemployed, to hold that it ought not to try and diminish unemployment other than in a negative way; nor is it any real use our girding at State interference with private enterprise when so many of the so-called restrictions which this entails are now part and parcel of our national life and government, the abolition of which would be politically impossible except in national catastrophe.

With regard to the financial dangers due to the size of the National Debt, Sir Ernest Benn appears to be more concerned as to the capital value of the debt per head of the population than about the annual service of the debt as a charge on the Budget. The economic importance of the latter lies not, indeed, in its magnitude, but in its effect on the distribution of the national income. It is only a transfer operation, but, as the amount transferred grows in size, it may have a considerable influence in hastening or in retarding a more equal distribution of incomes. There are very little data to go on in assessing its effect at the present time, but it seems more likely that the service on the National Debt gives rise to a transfer of wealth from the poor to the rich, rather than otherwise. But Sir Ernest Benn is not concerned with this aspect of the problem. He is worried because each citizen, man, woman, or child, has 166*l.* of National Debt on his shoulders, and each citizen, if called upon, is obviously incapable of discharging this obligation. This appears to be rather a meaningless, if not disingenuous, calculation. For one thing, some citizens are capable of discharging a very much bigger obligation; for another the State as a corporate body holds assets in various forms to set against the debt. It is true, nevertheless, that tangible assets are lacking to cover the greater part of the debt and that a call for repayment could not be met without wrecking the trade and finance of the country. But the proof of the pudding is in the eating, and as long as people are content to entrust their money to State funds and have confidence in the credit of the State, there is no reason why this position should arise. If confidence

in the State is ever lost, it will probably be owing to causes unconnected with the amount of the debt—e.g. defeat in war or revolution—and the magnitude of the debt will be an immaterial factor in the situation, as repayment would be impossible in any circumstances. The evil results which may arise from the immense increase in local government debt is a different matter, because not only is there less public confidence in local administration, but also because the funds of local authorities, other than the Grants supplied from the Exchequer, come from the rates, a rather narrow, inelastic source of supply. The credit of a local authority, therefore, is more dependent upon tangible assets than is that of the State, and it is highly undesirable that the debt of any local authority should grow faster than the rateable value of its particular local government area.

The ruthless taxation designed for the repayment of the National Debt advocated by Sir Ernest Benn seems to be unnecessarily heroic in the circumstances of the case. But this criticism does not imply that reckless borrowing and the making of no provision for debt redemption are to be defended. Such a policy would, sooner or later, lead to financial disaster.

The average man, if he turns from Sir Ernest Benn's eloquent plea for a return to the sound tenets of Victorian finance to the economic proposals of the Planners, will begin to wonder how it is that this country has ever managed to prosper under its present financial and social system, and will wonder still more how its people would endure the new system which they propose. The views put forward by Mr Macmillan in 'The Middle Way' are very similar to those presented in 'The Next Five Years,' a programme drawn up by various people, including Mr Macmillan, two or three years ago. The main elaboration in the present book of the suggestions made previously is a scheme for the distribution of free foodstuffs to the unemployed based on Mr Rowntree's famous menu. Mr Macmillan hopes that the measures which he advocates would eliminate the trade cycle and that this would have a favourable effect in the political sphere, particularly as regards international relations. He is struck, too, by the way in which various industries have initiated schemes of reorganisation in order to try and stave off the worst

effects of the last depression, and urges that the weakness of this voluntary planning lies in its being haphazard.

The purpose of his book, then, is to outline a national planning scheme, and it is interesting to note some of the basic principles which in his opinion must underlie such a scheme. 'The object of planning,' he states, 'is *not* to restrict production and solve the problem of plenty by creating an artificial scarcity. . . . The object of economic effort must be to *increase* the production of wealth, and, as a result of rising prosperity, to enable society to increase the leisure and cultural opportunities of *all* the people.' He considers that 'the individual has the right to demand that the economic life of society should be so organised as to guarantee the basic essentials of life in return for the minimum surrender of his time and liberty. These basic essentials—the right to live (e.g. maternity benefit and child welfare), the right to opportunity (e.g. education), the right to work or maintenance, the right to security (minimum standards of food, etc.)—can be secured only by a national plan, because 'the limit of taxable capacity,' to quote Mr Macmillan's words, 'would be reached long before a satisfactory minimum standard of comfort and security could be guaranteed by this method alone.' His aim is not limited to a few piecemeal reforms, but visualises a reorganisation of the whole natural economy so as to ensure a regularity of the consumer's demand at an irreducible minimum standard of life—a minimum which must correspond, as nearly as it can be made to, with the standard which is technically possible when all our resources are fully employed.

So far in his argument it might be imagined that Mr Macmillan was advocating a socialist panacea for all our economic and social ills, but he now goes on to state that an 'indiscriminate and unwise extension of social organisation, and therefore social discipline, might result not in the enlargement of man's welfare and freedom but in his enslavement. He would be coerced into a surrender of time and energy—and therefore of his individual freedom—for the increased production of things he had no desire to use.' He defends private enterprise because it ensures initiative, the adoption of new methods, the exploration of the market possibilities of new products,

and the speculative experimentation of new scientific discoveries, and he appears to believe that these advantages will be secured, if the present and unregulated system is retained for the 'production and distribution of a wide range of goods and services lying outside the field of minimum human needs.' In the latter part of his book Mr Macmillan outlines proposals for the establishment of a form of industrial organisation calculated (1) to curb the unwise speculative over-expansion of any industry; (2) to assist by an intelligent system of market anticipation in guiding capital investment into the correct channels and in the correct proportions; and (3) to maintain a balance in the quantities of separate goods which, if stability is to be preserved, must be exchanged one for another. He appears to be confident that an industrial organisation of this description would be brought about by means of legislation and by the setting up of an Industrial Advisory Council whose object it would be to survey industry as a whole. He recommends, therefore, the passing of an Industrial Organisation (Enabling) Bill, making it possible for industries which had reached the end of their expanding period to be rationalised and integrated. Such a policy would prevent a redundancy of plant, while the interests of consumers and the maintenance of increasing efficiency would be secured by the sense of social responsibility of the managers, by the scrutiny of consumers, and by advisory bodies. He then goes on to urge the compulsory reorganisation by the State of certain industries which are vital to the economic welfare. The degree of interference to be exercised by the State would vary according to circumstances. In some cases—e.g. industrial assurance, transport, fuel and power industries—for which 'the profit motive does not provide the right dynamic,' there should, in Mr Macmillan's opinion, be full state control, whereas industries of minor importance and new industries should be left 'to the vigorous initiative of private enterprise and uncontrolled competition.'

Having thus reorganised the conduct and control of the industries of the country, Mr Macmillan's next object is to devise a method of ensuring that our financial policy is so conducted as 'to keep the factors of production at the highest possible degree of permanent employment.'

In order to achieve this purpose, he considers (1) that the Bank of England should become a State-owned institution; and (2) that a National Investment Board should be set up to regulate the capital market by estimation of the savings available, to determine the volume of foreign lending, to coordinate and to supervise the issue of loans for the Government, etc., and to discourage 'semi-fraudulent' issues. This Board might also provide facilities for the exchange of securities under its own auspices. With regard to foreign trade, the powers and duties of the Import Duties Advisory Committee might, in Mr Macmillan's opinion, be enlarged. He considers that this body should register exporting transactions and could arrange for the bulk purchase of a considerable proportion of our imports—not necessarily on its own account. Profits made on import transactions would be spent in subsidies to exports in cases where it could be shown that the prevailing world prices would not bring in sufficient to maintain the existing wage-level of the workers employed.

Needless to say, the whole of the industrial, financial, and foreign policy of the country would be coordinated by an advisory National Economic Council presided over by a Minister of Economics. The Central Bank, which is to take the place of the Bank of England, the National Investment Board, the Foreign Trade Organisation, and the Industrial Advisory Council would thus conduct their operations in accordance with a common policy. The personnel of all these authorities would be appointed by the Government after consultation with the interests affected—and yet Mr Macmillan assures his readers that he has no intention of creating 'an authoritarian bureaucracy' because his Economic Council 'would be broadly based upon the subsidiary authorities.' Mr Macmillan, although he has sufficient confidence in his planned economy to believe that the adoption of his scheme would lead to a considerable decrease in unemployment, realises that there are always likely to be unforeseen fluctuations in industry and commerce which must be guarded against. The consumer's purchasing power and standard of life must be maintained, therefore, in order to 'check in its early stages any tendency towards depression that might still arise.' He proposes to achieve

this purpose by a variety of methods which, to be effective, would involve a good deal of contentious legislation and an increase of State interference calculated to arouse considerable opposition. He advocates the adoption of a minimum wage to be fixed according to the cost of living; the payment of a portion of unemployment benefit in kind; an increased benefit to be given in the form of free supplies of essential foodstuffs; and the setting up of a national scheme of distribution which would reduce costs and by means of which subsidised supplies of food, particularly milk, could be given to children and various classes of people. Yet another body, a National Nutrition Board, would be set up to buy supplies from producers, both at home and abroad, and to distribute them through its own retailing organisation. As a result of all this machinery, Mr Macmillan triumphantly asserts that 'the State would have ready contact with every household' and that food supplies could be given as part of system under all social services.

Before making any comments upon or venturing upon any criticism of Mr Macmillan's proposals for the reconstruction of our economic system, it seems advisable to study Mr Metz's solution for our monetary problems. His book is complementary to Mr Macmillan's, although his scheme of inheritance of estates by the State would probably be too radical for his fellow planner. The ideas which he puts forward, however, are elaborated to a much greater extent than are those of Mr Macmillan and his book is therefore more useful as a guide to a conception of a planned society; nor would it be doing justice to his work not to emphasise the fact that Mr Metz frankly admits that a successful application of the measures which he advocates is only possible if they are dictated by Christian principles. Men and women, he considers, must cease to be intent upon their individual pursuits and must unite for one common purpose—the 'Christian reform of the economic and financial order.' The defects of the present monetary system, according to Mr Metz, arise from the fact that we have imposed upon ourselves a vassalage to gold. The Bank of England, which sets the pace to the banking system as a whole, has to regulate its credit policy according to its gold reserve; the power of the financial system, by means

of the so-called open-market policy, to take the initiative in the expansion or in the contraction of credit bears no relation to the process of production and interchange of goods; there is no means of ensuring that the monetary resources of the nation are fully employed or of preventing the expansion of credit for speculative purposes which so often leads to results disastrous for industry. Moreover, statesmen have failed to appreciate the vital need for balanced external payment accounts, and Mr Metz complains that, as things are now, an uncontrolled capital migration divorced from the international movement of goods is countenanced with equanimity.

The remedies which he proposes are largely in the monetary sphere, but he is careful, nevertheless, to point out that 'no banking system, however perfect, could avail against the evils of unbalanced production, characteristic of our society, in which economic activity is in the main unplanned.' Mr Metz would like to see a control established over the balance of international payments with a view to the achievement of an equilibrium, so far as this country is concerned. This he thinks could be achieved by prohibiting the export of domestic capital other than in the form of goods and by offsetting any inflow of foreign capital or repatriation of domestic capital by the acquisition of the corresponding gold or foreign exchange, and *vice versa*. Gold should be divorced from the credit structure, and a Gold Settlement Fund should be formed under the administration of a Foreign Exchange Board. Minor and purely temporary discrepancies in the current balance of payments could be met out of this fund, out of which also the money should be found for exchanging gold with repatriated capital, etc. All foreign exchange transactions should be conducted by the banking system and by licensed dealers for account of the Foreign Exchange Board. The hoarding of gold should be prohibited. No loans, other than loans for self-liquidating commercial purposes, should be granted to foreign customers by the banking system. Fluctuations in the exchanges should be kept within circumscribed limits by reciprocal arrangements among gold-holding countries for definite restricted periods. All trade treaties should provide for revision in case of a depreciation of the money of any of the participants in terms of goods.

Mr Metz also advocates the creation of a National Investment Trust, to be directed by the National Investment Board. The shares of this Trust would be the only security available to the public for new investment under the New Order, for in its hands would be centralised the financing of all new capital assets and of any additional permanent working capital required by enterprise in so far as such capital is not met by enterprise out of its own resources. A fixed minimum interest rate and 50 per cent. of net profits should be paid to the shareholders by the Trust, and idle bank balances would be brought into the Trust, compulsorily if they were not surrendered voluntarily. The principal function of the Trust would be to investigate all proposals for new financing other than for self-liquidating purposes, and approval would not be given unless the *entrepreneur* were a member of the Trade Association for his industry.

The Bank of England's gold holding would, under the New Order, be transferred to the Gold Settlement Fund, as it would no longer be required for the regulation of the credit structure, and neither the Bank of England nor the banking system would be authorised to buy or to sell securities in the market. The Bank of England itself would be nationalised, and a Banking Board would be set up to control the organisation of the whole financial system. The nationalisation of the banking system is intended by Mr Metz to prevent a rise in the rate of interest, which he contends is brought about by bank policy and has a very depressing effect. Under his new system the banks would be confined to lending for self-liquidating purposes (working capital) at low cost. In addition to the purely financial reforms, to which attention has been drawn, the New Order advocated by Mr Metz would entail other drastic changes in our present economic and social structure. No one would be entitled to bequeath income in excess of 5000*l.* in the aggregate, and the ownership of the assets comprising an estate would be vested in National Estates, a public body in which, in due course, all the capital assets of the nation, except those owned by the living generation, would be vested. A minimum wage and a maximum salary would be established by law. The educational system would be reformed, in order to provide extended opportunities for

higher education to be assisted financially by the State. Idle people would be subjected to extra taxation. An Economic Council, subordinate to Parliament, would be set up as the supreme planning, investigating, and co-ordinating authority for the whole of the economic activities of the country. A Control Board of Enterprise, to be elected by the Trade Associations, would direct the execution of the plans. Trade agreements would be made with other countries on barter principle.

Having thus outlined the main principles of the form of planning as set out by Mr Macmillan and Mr Metz, it remains to consider how planning in general might contribute to the cure of our present discontents and how the particular schemes put forward in these two books might in particular be expected to achieve this end. The defects in the present economic system have been diagnosed by a strong critic of capitalism to be as follows: crises arise because of the mistaken forecasts of producers, the defective operation of our monetary system, and, possibly, the growing rigidity of at least the older capitalist societies. There follow from these defects in the system all the well-known phenomena of these recurring periods of depression—widespread unemployment, idle plant, destruction of produce in order to support prices, restriction schemes, and so on. But 'more important, . . . there lurks in the background an unescapable conflict between the individual and the whole society which must always condemn the purely individualistic type of economy to a pathetically low level of achievement.' The interest of each individual producer that the particular commodity which he offers for sale should be scarce and dear, does not conform with the general interest of the community, and for this reason all attempts at organisation and agreement between producers tend to break down in hard times. Moreover, since money breeds money, capitalism inevitably leads to great inequalities of income and to antagonism between the different partners—managers and workers—in production.

Mr Metz and Mr Macmillan would both maintain that the above defects, giving rise to their concomitant disadvantages, could be removed without substituting a socialist for a capitalist system. This optimistic view of the possibility of transforming the capitalist system into

something entirely different appears to be based, partly at any rate, upon a study of the various reorganisation schemes—coal, electricity, agricultural, etc.—which have been effected in this country within recent years. Since these important changes have been made under a capitalist system, why, argues Mr Macmillan, should they not be made really effective within the same framework by bringing them all within a coordinated plan for the whole of industry? Probably most Socialists would dispute this, and describe the recent efforts at planning as the last despairing attempts of the supporters of a decaying system to have their cake and eat it. Their contention is that effective planning is impossible unless it implies ownership. Without such control, 'a general plan which is built up from the partial plans made by sectional groups in the pursuit of their own interest can at best represent an unstable compromise between the competing designs of units, each of which inevitably puts its own advantage first and that of the general public only a poor second.'\* It seems difficult to refute this point of view or to believe that the schemes devised by Mr Metz and Mr Macmillan could be made effective under any form of capitalism. Indeed, the system advocated by Mr Metz would in a comparatively short time be indistinguishable from Socialism, whilst it is extremely doubtful whether Mr Macmillan's machinery would have much effect either in the way of modifying the disadvantages or of adding to the advantages of the present order of things.

Take, for example, Mr Metz's scheme of inheritance. In due course, if it were adopted, a good proportion of the land and of the capital assets hitherto in private hands would be the unconditional property of the nation represented by National Estates. This body would, moreover, also acquire, as time went on, a controlling holding in most industrial concerns, through the medium of the National Investment Trust. Can a system of this nature be distinguished from the socialisation of property? Then, again, Mr Metz does not make quite clear what would be the precise limits of the activities reserved for capitalists under his New Order. It would appear that they would still be allowed to save, but the disposition

---

\* See 'Plan or no Plan,' by Mrs Wootton.

of the sums saved would be in the hands of the National Investment Board, so that the position would resemble that in Soviet Russia. They would also be required to manage industry, but, obviously, they would be in the position of servants rather than of rulers, for their activities would be subject to the supervision of the Trade Associations of their industries and by the N.I.B. They would still be expected to be enterprising, and presumably Mr Metz thinks that this expectation would be fulfilled because he has not thought it necessary to abrogate the profit motive.

Certainly, the incentives to enterprise would be greater than in a formally socialist State, because (1) there would be no restrictions on the amount of income a man might receive in his lifetime, and (2) he would be able to invest his surplus income in his own enterprise. He would, on the other hand, be prevented by law from bequeathing more than a certain sum of money to his descendants, and, probably more important, if he had not the money himself to finance a new venture, he could only obtain it by fitting his scheme into the planned economic requirements of his industry and of the nation. New inventions, too, in exploiting which the freest play of enterprise is desirable, could only be brought into use with the consent of the Central Board of Enterprise and its use would be regulated by the Economic Council. There is no reason why *necessarily* these last two factors should militate against experimentation and, therefore, at industrial progress—and yet it is somewhat unlikely that in practice they would not.

The abolition of free competition and the establishment of controlled Capitalism seem, therefore, to lead to Socialism. Would Mr Macmillan's system in fact prevent such a development? If it would not, it would lose all point, because it certainly would not establish conditions in which free competition would function. Both he and Mr Metz are at great pains to emphasise the futility of piecemeal planning. The latter escapes the charge that he has fallen into the trap himself, but it is not so easy to exonerate Mr Macmillan. His system seems to be all form and no content, and although superficially coordinated, it would, if put into practice, not only reproduce but even accentuate the vices of partial planning.

The greatest danger of partial planning is that it might lead to various groups in the State—various industries, in the present context—securing a privileged position because of restrictions on, say, the entry to the industry. These groups would thus be able to exploit either the people from whom they bought or the people to whom they sold. Some particular industry might, of course, under a whole-hearted system of planning, be favoured above all others, but this would presumably be the result of a deliberate calculation that the social welfare of the nation would thereby be increased. Alternatively, under partial planning the industries concerned might be so closely controlled that a full exercise of monopolistic powers was in fact impossible. Several public utilities—e.g. the London Passenger Transport Board—are in this position at the present time. Mr Macmillan would prevent this sort of thing happening by having a national plan directed by a national coordinating authority. Unfortunately, however, he gives no indication of the means by which the carrying out of this plan would in fact be ensured, or how the full employment of resources would be secured. Many industries under his scheme would presumably be given power to restrict entry and to close down inefficient plant, and thus to gain a pretty strong control over output. Suppose, then, that selling prices were lowered, suppose (as would be inevitable) that people were thrown out of work as the result of the closing of redundant plant—what are the arrangements provided by Mr Macmillan to deal with these eventualities? He has nothing very definite to say with regard to this aspect of the situation. He seems to rely, rather touchingly, on 'social responsibility' and 'the scrutiny of consumers and the advisory bodies.' But is there any reason why these factors should be more to the fore under his system than they are now, and if they are ineffective now, is there any reason to suppose that they would be any more effective then? Mr Macmillan refutes the argument that prices might be raised by pointing out that sales would fall. They would, of course, fall unless there were a completely inelastic demand. But the amount of fall would depend upon the degree of elasticity of the demand. The lower the demand the more likely it is that a higher total income would be

secured by selling a certain number of units at a high price, than by selling more units at a lower price. It is true that overheads per unit fall with an increase in production, but they might not fall fast enough to counteract the advantages of a restriction of production.

'Redundancy' is the villain of Mr Macmillan's piece. But it cannot be got rid of merely by closing down plant and making no arrangements to deal with the social consequences. Mr Macmillan deals with the possibility of such arrangements in the sketchiest manner, and seems unaware of the magnitude of the social problems involved. Moreover, in the case of most industries the lines of reorganisation are apparently to be left to the decision of the producers themselves. Is there any reason to suppose that they would invariably set up a few large units enjoying the advantages of large-scale production—a course of action which Mr Macmillan appears to have in mind? Might they not rather perpetuate the existence of small inefficient units by a quota system such as is adopted in the coal industry to-day? Again, most industries under Mr Macmillan's scheme are to be left to choose whether they will or will not reorganise. He seems to take it for granted that those in which competitive expansion has slowed down will reorganise in their own interests. But recent experience in the coal and cotton industries does not point to the adoption of such a policy. No sanctions designed to enforce the policy of the Economic Council are provided by Mr Macmillan, short of taking the industry over by the State, nor under his scheme, unlike that of Mr Metz, is investment in new industrial ventures to be controlled by a National Investment Board. It is true that Mr Macmillan recommends that certain industries should be brought under public ownership or under some form of direct public control, but these are mostly the industries in which a natural monopoly exists—e.g. transport, power, etc.—and it seems open to doubt whether he would welcome the idea of the state ownership of an industry like cotton, the products of which compete in the overseas market, or with other products—e.g. artificial silk—at home.

In any complete system of planned national economy, solutions would have to be found for the two problems of

rigidity and pricing. Industrial reorganisation might lead not only to monopolistic exploitation, but also to fixation of the existing conditions—or to the latter without the former. Stability might be secured at the cost of progress, for there would no longer be the incentive to outstrip one's competitors which still spurs on enterprise in a large part of the industrial field at the present time. Any expansion of existing output would be difficult, as would also the establishment of new industries. Mr Macmillan fancies that in his scheme of partial planning he has guarded against this danger by leaving expanding industries to the influence of healthy competition. But let it be supposed that a new industry were to threaten to supplant the products of some old one—a perfectly fair supposition, since this sort of thing is happening constantly at the present time—what line of policy then should the Economic Council adopt? Should it act boldly and pay off the old industry, or allow it, by the exercise of its monopolistic control of the market, to oust the new-comer from the field, or just let it die a painful death? In actual practice, it is to be suspected that the old industry, owing to the influence of vested interests or of political considerations, would be bolstered up at the expense of the new.

The difference regarding the solution of such problems under a system of complete planning would lie in the fact that the necessity for making difficult decisions would not so much be forced upon the planning authority by circumstances outside its control as left to its own initiative. An omnipotent, omniscient authority could no doubt prevent many wasteful ventures by directing resources into channels whose utility would be the most long-lived; but is it not unrealistic to expect that such a policy would in fact be followed? A planning authority can have only a few ideas in its head at once, it can probably pursue one or two of these ideas pretty efficiently, as is done in Germany to-day. But the kind of progress—in standards of living, of security, of culture—which is called for to-day, is not associated with the achievement of any one objective, however important it may appear. A battle-cry of 'guns, not butter,' may inspire men to sacrifice some of their material wants for the sake of national security or aggrandisement, but the more prosaic

task of enlisting popular support for changes rendered possible by new inventions or by a diversion of demand is a matter of greater difficulty. The very fact, too, that the State would have a positive part to play in a planned economy might complicate the position—for political influences would still be actively at work so long as a parliamentary form of government continued to exist.

The problem of pricing in a planned economy is one which has only recently been seriously exercising the minds of Socialists, for in the past it has been usually taken for granted that the economic disposition of resources in a socialistic community would be easily arranged. Neither Mr Macmillan nor Mr Metz has concerned himself with the mechanism of pricing, presumably because each of them imagines that, as Capitalism will be preserved under his form of planning, pricing will look after itself. The essence of the problem to be solved is how to retain the freedom of the consumer to spend his money as he likes and, at the same time, to organise production from a single source without the guide of competition to direct resources into the best channels. The easiest way of organising production successfully in a planned economy would be by rationing the goods bought by consumers. There would, then, be no need to predict consumers' demand, for demand would not exist in the economic sense. The market would automatically be cleared because each consumer would be allotted such an amount of each of the species of goods produced as would finish the whole supply, if each consumer claimed his ration. The result, if the consumer did not do so, would not be very serious, as he could not spread disequilibrium farther by transferring his allowance to another commodity. Such a system, however, as we have seen, inevitably involves an uncompromising dictatorship and finds few advocates among present-day Socialists.

Now, it may well be that in an undeveloped country like Russia an arbitrary direction of production by a planning authority can be carried out not only without harm but with positive advantage to consumers. For where most people lack many of the ordinary necessities of food, clothing, household goods, etc., vast quantities of these can be put on the market and nearly all the factors of production devoted to them without much fear

that resources could be better employed elsewhere. But this is not the case in a country like Great Britain, where consumers are accustomed to a wide choice, and even if it can be argued that the smallness of their incomes effectually confines the freedom of choice of a large section of the population within narrow limits, the situation could be remedied—indeed, is being remedied—better by a more equal distribution of incomes primarily through taxation and improved social services than through planned production of commodities. A similar difficulty of lack of criterion arises in connection with saving and the building up of capital assets. Since the planning authority would be called upon to regulate saving, there can be no estimate of the extent to which people might be prepared to sacrifice the present to the future, and the amount, therefore, of the resources to be devoted at any given time to production for future needs would have to be decided upon an arbitrary basis.

A planned economy, if the criticisms in this article are accepted, would appear, therefore, to offer little or no prospect of our needs being served any more efficiently—or perhaps it might be said less inefficiently—than under the present system. It might, nevertheless, be able to abolish some of the maladjustments which are so conspicuous to-day. There is little doubt, for instance, that it could provide full employment for labour, but only at the cost of a misapplication of the factors of production and therefore of a lowered standard of life for employed labour. A regulated programme of public works would, in all probability, be preferable to planning because, although it might be less successful in bringing about a total abolition of unemployment, it should help to raise, rather than to lower, the standard of living. This opinion is based on the supposition that the construction of public works would not be carried out by the State as a means of giving employment to the unemployed, but would be embarked upon at times when a trade depression was threatened as a means of injecting money into the economic system with the object of stimulating confidence and of preventing a disastrous fall in expenditure on consumption and capital goods. The reason why the undertaking of public works (which would have to be financed on borrowed money) would probably be a more

efficacious measure in a time of economic emergency than the lowering of interest rates—though this latter measure should be adopted concurrently—is that it is more rapid in its effect and ensures that works of capital development are in fact undertaken.

A policy for the carrying out of public works, if it were undertaken only as a fillip to trade, would be nothing like so extensive a policy as that which would be entailed by a planned economy, and it would be possible, therefore, to avoid a rigidity in the economic structure due to widespread commitments on behalf of the State, which, as has been pointed out in this article, is almost inevitable under a wide scheme of economic planning. It is sometimes asserted that no effective public works programme can be carried out except under Socialism. There is little basis, however, for such an assertion. There are plenty of enterprises—rearmament, housing, roads, etc.—in which the State is now either a large buyer or a large producer, and what is needed in times of economic emergency is the spending of more money by the Government for the public welfare and in such spheres as may be most advantageous to the state of trade. It is essential of course in any policy of this kind that a programme of public works should be prepared in advance and that power to embark upon the schemes should be obtained in readiness for an economic slump—for promptitude of action is essential for success.

The old system of individualistic Capitalism, however much Sir Ernest Benn may regret it, has gone for ever, and in its place is growing up in England a new economic system more in harmony with modern humanitarianism, inspired neither by Bolshevik nor by Fascist ideals. The *via media* to a new economic system is being gradually discovered not by means of the rigid and State-controlled methods advocated by the planners, but by the methods of trial and error which, although unscientific, are more in consonance with English tradition and more calculated, therefore, to be acceptable to all sections of the community.

CUTHBERT HEADLAM.

## Art. 7.—JAPANESE AMBITIONS.

THE happenings in Germany, especially during the latter part of the past year, so concentrated attention that the war in Spain and in equal or even greater measure the war in China faded into insignificance. The war in Spain, it was comfortably assumed, would soon reach a stage when settlement could be expected and even expedited by the Munich agreement. The war in China was, no doubt, very terrible, but the Far East was too far away, the names were too outlandish to trouble Englishmen very much so long as Hong Kong was not touched and so long as trade in Shanghai was possible. Men talked airily of Japanese ambitions without realising very vividly where these ambitions might eventually lead them. The sympathy of our countrymen generally was with the Chinese, as the victims of aggression and the under-dog; every one admired the new spirit of resistance which had enabled the Chinese to withstand the Japanese invasion in a manner and to an extent of which they had not hitherto shown themselves capable. There may also have been an underlying feeling, however vague, that China represented a democracy fighting the powers of evil in the shape of an Imperialist enemy. But, though sympathy was not lacking, no overt action was taken. British ships were occasionally damaged by aircraft and the Press made what capital they could from such incidents, but for the most part the Chinese news was read with half-hearted understanding and little attempt to follow the course of the invasion.

Yet the final victory of Japan may, and probably will, have more far-reaching effects upon the world than even the more problematical victory of Germany in the event of a European war. It is not yet a century since Commodore Perry forced an entry into Japan and broke down the barriers which she had maintained for upwards of 200 years. About forty years later Japan was at war with China, and every one expected that China would make short work of her small antagonist. Exactly the reverse happened. China was defeated on land and annihilated at sea, with the result that she yielded the island of Formosa and the Liao Tung Peninsula with Port Arthur.

This latter was the first acquisition of Japan on the mainland of Asia, but she was forced to relinquish it under pressure from Russia, France, and Germany. Almost at once Russia, yearning as usual for an ice-free port, obtained a lease of the place and fortified Port Arthur. Only ten years later Japan and Russia were at war over a dispute originating in forest leases on the Yalu River and in the Russian reluctance to evacuate Manchuria according to arrangements agreed upon. This time the world was ready to take Japan more seriously, but it was not thought that the Japanese, an Asiatic people, had much chance against the powerful military Empire of Russia, even though communications and bases were all in the Japanese favour. Again the world was wrong. The Japanese set methodically to work to press back the Russians; they invested Port Arthur, which fell after a long siege; they won perhaps no decisive victory in the field, but each time they met the Russians they had the better of it. More important still, they practically drove the Far Eastern fleet off the sea and at the siege of Port Arthur destroyed at their leisure all that was left of it, which had taken refuge in the harbour. Finally came the crushing disaster of Tsu-Shima—to the Japanese a second Trafalgar—when the Baltic fleet was swept off the face of the sea, only one ship escaping to Vladivostok and two or three others to neutral ports.

Japan had now shown of what she was capable. The terms of the Treaty of Portsmouth were not harsh. Japan obtained recognition of her preponderance in Korea, the Russian leases of Liao-Tung and Port Arthur, and the evacuation of Manchuria by both sides: an important point since the refusal of Russia to evacuate Manchuria had been one of the main causes of the war. Thus the territorial gains were small, and perhaps to Japan the principal result of the war was her entry into world-politics as a nation to be reckoned with. Years went by during which she steadily strengthened herself, not only in armament by sea and land but also by the vigour of her commercial enterprise. Her great towns—Tokyo, Yokohama, Kobe, Osaka—became industrialised on the Western model, and very soon, chiefly by virtue of incessant labour and of cheap man-power, entered into competition with the acknowledged leaders of commerce

among the nations. The Great War came, but though the Japanese could offer little or no help in the main theatre of war, she turned the Germans out of Kiao Chao and policed the Far Eastern waters. By this time she had won for herself a place among the leading nations and was reckoned among the 'Big Five' who deliberated at Versailles. Her navy was such that she was able to enter into an arrangement with Britain and America by which she undertook not to build in excess of seven-tenths of the navies of either of the Anglo-Saxon Powers.

Of late years she has followed an expansionist policy. One of the fruits of her wars with China and Russia was the recognition of her predominance in Korea, and when she was firmly established there she definitely annexed it. Having thus got a footing on the Asiatic continent (for the Liao-Tung Peninsula was theoretically Chinese), she definitely adopted a continental policy, and her next move was in Manchuria. Manchuria was not originally part of the Chinese Empire, even after the ancient principalities had become merged in a unified Empire, but it became practically Chinese when it gave a dynasty to China and received a vast tide of immigration from the south. Japan intervened. She espoused the cause of the exiled Chinese Emperor, established for him the State of Manchukuo, and herself took charge of it, not by any definite act of annexation but as the Paramount Power and virtually the ruler in the new State. She then proceeded to pick a quarrel with China and advanced as far as the Great Wall, brushing aside with ease the Chinese resistance. Thus by 1932 she had taken over the whole of Korea and established a so-called Protectorate in the new State of Manchukuo, which became virtually her own. She was aiming at the hegemony of the Far East, but the acquisition of Korea and Manchuria was obviously not enough. A new expedition was planned to obtain such predominance in China that she could drive out all foreign competition and turn the country into a Japanese province, not perhaps by annexation but by the more modern method of economic penetration and political domination. She met with considerable resistance and roused the conscience of the world against her. But in spite of this she has occupied the most important cities in China—amongst them Peiping, Nanking, Shanghai, Han-

kow, and Canton. Her publicly avowed object is to impose on China (with the implied consent of the latter) a Government which shall counteract what she considers to be the Communist tendency in China. Every one knows that whatever there may be in this claim, it is very far from being the whole story.

Although the Japanese have a long history dating from 600 B.C., according to their own accounts, when the first Emperor Jimmu Tenno was reigning, they are young in the conditions of the modern world. The famous Restoration only dates from 1868. The whole tradition of the Japanese race is militaristic. From very early times the soldier's was the highest valued profession; the Samurai formed a caste of their own. During the mediæval period, when Japan had little or no intercourse with the outer world, not, as during the Tokugawa Shogunate, because they were secluded by governmental order, but simply because they had no occasion for such intercourse, except to a limited degree with the neighbouring courts of Korea and China, there was constant civil war between the different Daimios, whose feudal retainers the Samurai were and to whom they owed implicit obedience. The military spirit was thus kept alive, and in the sixteenth century, when the Empire was united for the first time under Toyotomi Hideyoshi, an expedition was sent against Korea, which laid waste the land from end to end, though curiously enough the fleet was defeated. Again during the whole period of the eclipse of the Emperors, which lasted for over 700 years, the fiction was kept up that he was the divine descendant of the Sun-Goddess, ruling over a divine people, men who like the Jews considered themselves to be the chosen of God. This attitude of mind naturally became intensified when at the Restoration the Emperor became in fact as well as in theory the ruler of a united people. Moreover, the common folk who had been regarded as of no account (the opposition to Hideyoshi was based upon his humble origin) were now admitted to a share in the national feeling. Patriotism was raised to a degree bordering on frenzy. The Japanese soldier, who has always been distinguished for bravery, was and is contemptuous of death, and shows himself as willing to shed his blood for the State as he had formerly been willing to die in the service of his Daimio. The

nation found an outlet for this spirit in the war of 1894 with China. Japan is a long way from the Western world ; it was not difficult to keep the secret of their military development, even though they had enlisted teachers from Britain, France, and Germany to help them in modelling an army and navy on the Western plan. China having failed to appreciate the lesson of Western power as exemplified in the Opium War of 1840, went down like a row of ninepins before the Japanese onslaught. Japan with her marvellous power of adaptation utilised the next ten years in perfecting her military arrangements. Though she did struggle long and arduously to maintain peace, the thought of a Russian domination of Korea, the only point from which she is vulnerable, especially by an enemy whose chief strength is on land, was very disquieting. She was even disposed to think, or was worked up to think, that this point was vital to her existence. There was moreover the lure of Port Arthur, the loss of which rankled deeply. It was an especial grievance that Russia, who had been so largely instrumental in thus depriving her of perhaps her most important tangible reward of the war, should so soon afterwards be herself in possession of the fortress which Japan regarded as the key to any further continental adventures.

The Russian war of 1904-5 not only gave back Port Arthur to Japan but it had the effect of inspiring in her a tremendous increase of ambition. Japan, like almost everyone else, had hardly dared to think that an Asiatic people could stand against a European army, reputed to be exceptionally formidable. It was possibly characteristic but it was also a measure of her anxiety that she made such careful preparations that when the war came she was ready *jusqu'au dernier bouton*. At the close of the war both sides had had enough of it ; Japan herself by all accounts was nearly exhausted. I have said that Japan was inspired by a great ambition. That was the most important result of the war. Having got the better of a great European Power, having acquired an army which had beaten the Russians in pitched battles and a navy which had annihilated the Russian fleet, she began to think herself invincible. The claim to the hegemony of the Far East, the subsequent adventures in Korea and Manchuria, and the further penetration into China beyond

the Great Wall—all had their origin in the result of the Russian campaign. It is well to remember that the annexation of Korea took place in 1910, only some five years after the close of the Russian war. The country was to a certain extent an outlet for the surplus population, but the Japanese are not popular there. The Koreans are neither Chinese nor Japanese; their leanings as a dependent people have always been rather to China than to Japan. In Japan itself they are regarded as aliens who have no part nor lot with the Children of the Gods. They have no political rights and are generally despised. Nevertheless the Japanese set to work to develop and to industrialise the new province, and in this respect she can claim considerable success. Dr Longford, however, says of the Japanese administration of Korea :

‘ Her failure is especially apparent in Korea, the most important and extensive of her colonies. . . . No check was imposed by either officials or police. Neither the Japanese subordinate civil official nor the policeman is wholly free from the Prussian spirit. Both believe in themselves that no matter what they do they can never be wrong and that their first duty is towards their own fellow-countryman, who is to be supported, no matter what he does, against all aliens; and Koreans are still aliens. . . . The whole face of the country has been changed for the better. But all these benefits have been accompanied by an orgy of tyranny, and the result is that now Korea is the Ireland of Japan. . . . She has stifled every semblance of civil liberty; she has ruled a people who are gentle, lovable, dignified, peaceful even to meekness, with rods of iron. . . . The result is that she is as much hated to-day as she was when Hideyoshi’s army withdrew from its scene of desolation and ruin.’

It can only be said in favour of the Japanese that they have not yet had a century of experience of Western civilisation and that they were forced to adopt it when they themselves had hardly emerged from mediæval Asiaticism. There is much to cavil at, much to dislike in European civilisation, and with the example of the Jews before us we could hardly complain if Asiatics did not choose to follow its lead. But Japan has chosen deliberately to Westernise herself. She has shown a singular power of adaptation to wholly new conditions, and if she has chosen to betray her overweening sense of her own

superiority and has thus adopted one of the worst characteristics of European nations, especially in their dealings with coloured races, we may regard her attitude as unfortunate, but can hardly blame her. She has, however, not borrowed this trait from Europe. Accounts agree that the Japanese people, so suave and courteous outwardly, are capable of a ruthlessness and a complete indifference to human life which would outdo those of any European people. It is in their nature. From the days when Samurai wore two swords, the one with which to fight and the other with which to commit hara-kiri, up to the days when Japanese sacrificed themselves in holocausts round Port Arthur, this has been the national characteristic.

And after Korea, Manchuria. Whatever may have been the protestations of Japan—and she made good capital over the Communistic flavour of the Kuomintang, with its flirtations with Moscow—no one really doubts that her real object was the acquisition of yet another province, this time as large as France and Germany combined, under the specious disguise of a Protectorate. In doing this, however, she was again only copying methods used in Europe. The French Protectorates in Tunisia and Indo-China and the British in Asia and in Africa are to all intents and purposes parts of the respective Empires, to say nothing of Mandated territories which are bound to take on the colour of the Mandatory and which have almost come to be regarded as its private property, in spite of the more or less *pro forma* supervision of the League of Nations. The difference, however, was this. Whereas the French in Tunis and the British elsewhere can claim that the countries contiguous to undoubted possessions are really in need of protection against neighbours potentially hostile, Manchuria, whatever its origin, was predominantly Chinese and the Japanese had no shadow of right to be there. We may, of course, concede that in history and especially in that of Asia, such things are not unknown, and that for a nation so lately emerged from the traditions of the past it was not unnatural to apply the principles and the methods to which they had been so long accustomed. We may further allow that the potential enemy was not China at all, but Russia. Indeed, it may be said that the fear of Russia, the doubt whether Russian in-

fluence might not in the end prevail in China and result in a Far Eastern Alliance which would threaten the sacred soil of Japan, is at the bottom of the whole Chinese adventure. We ought not to forget that it was the pressure of Russia in Manchuria, with the consequent threat to the coasts opposite to Japan, which were largely instrumental in bringing about the war of 1904. Be this as it may, the conquest of Manchuria—for conquest it was—was undertaken on the flimsiest of excuses, and the Chinese, as before, were swept away almost contemptuously by the Japanese advance. The invasion had hardly begun before the Japanese were in possession of Jehol and had reached the Great Wall.

It has been said that every young nation tends to be aggressive. We have seen the confirmation of this in the advance of Prussia and still more recently in that of Italy. Japan, as measured by history, is not a young nation, but she is the youngest of the Great Powers. Ever since she emerged from her self-imposed seclusion, she has been learning the methods of the West, including, be it said, the 'methods of barbarism' in so far as she had anything to learn in that respect. Her population has been increasing by leaps and bounds; in 1871 it was 33,000,000; by 1919, including the colonies, it was 77,000,000; and is said to be increasing at the rate of a million a year. That would mean that by 1938 it has passed the 90,000,000 mark.\* Obviously the original islands of Japan cannot support such a multitude. She has, therefore, to expand and she has found an outlet in Korea, in Manchuria, in Formosa, and in the Mandated Islands of the Caroline and Marshall groups. But her instinct is military; she boasts of it. Her desire is not merely to find an outlet for her millions, but also and probably mainly to extend her Empire by conquest. She has forged for herself, though with European help at the outset, an army and navy which may not be invincible but are comparable with any army or navy in the world. It is as natural for Japan to have the will to conquer as it is for the tiger to seek its prey.

Accordingly, her appetite whetted by her easy con-

---

\* This is an underestimate. In 'Japan over Asia' (1938) the author puts the figure at 97,000,000.

quests, she embarked on the Chinese adventure of 1937. She did not expect to meet with much resistance. The Chinese are pre-eminently a peaceful people. Though in early times, before the Chinese Empire was consolidated, wars were incessant among the feudal states, it is difficult to find one of any importance that was not more or less forced upon her. And in the strenuous conditions of the modern world, that nation is listened to which is in a position to threaten. It is power which has the last word. A Japanese lecturer, trying to impress his hearers with Japan's contribution to art, to literature, to science—in a word, to culture—found them indifferent, but when he spoke of the number of Russians they had killed, he at once riveted their attention. Consequently the Japanese despise the Chinese because, as they thought, they could not fight. They were undeceived. Under the leadership of Chiang Kai-Shek the Chinese had evolved a patriotism of which they were thought to be incapable. The Japanese have taken cities, but have not really subdued the country, any more than an enemy who has taken possession of Delhi, Cawnpore, Calcutta, and Bombay has subdued India.

It is not altogether a fantastic flight of imagination to suppose that the Chinese adventure is really a *ballon d'essai* for more serious experiments. The Japanese are confronted with powerful nations in every direction except the east. In the north-west a further advance will take them to the Russian frontier; in the south beyond Canton they will have to reckon with the French; to the west, if they ever succeed in getting so far, they will challenge Great Britain. It is one thing to invade China, now imbued with an unexpected patriotism but badly armed and without a navy—yet even in China they are finding it difficult to make any real headway. It is quite another to challenge any one of three great European Powers, armed with the most modern weapons and equipped with the most up-to-date armies. Yet it looks as if Japan were aiming not merely at the conquest of China and the hegemony of the Far East, but at the subjugation of all Eastern Asia and possibly of the whole continent. That she may lose millions of men in the Chinese adventure does not matter; her sons are quite willing to lay down their lives for an adventure that is worth while. She may

also drain herself to the verge of bankruptcy ; she has a high national debt and her credit is already low in the world's markets. But that too does not greatly matter. With the Chinese market at her command she trusts to making good the losses entailed by the war. She knows her own powers of recuperation ; she has faith in her own powers of organisation. Her methods may be ruthless, but she can point to the industrial development in Korea and Manchuria as an earnest of what she expects to do in China. Moreover, she has the illimitable patience of the Oriental. The war in China may cripple her for a while, but she is content to wait. Perhaps in twenty years, perhaps in fifty, she will again be in a financial position to undertake a first-class war. The Russian war nearly exhausted her, but in some thirty years she has been able to embark on another hardly less exhausting. That she covets any part of Siberia, unless it be the extreme point which is Vladivostok, seems unlikely, except for reasons of prestige ; the northern part of Manchuria is already proving too rigorous for serious colonisation to a people accustomed to a latitude which is that of North Africa ; even the Russian railway from Leningrad and Moscow never exceeds a latitude of some 52° or 53°. There is, however, a fairer field to the south ; the Philippines are vulnerable from the base at Formosa or from Hainan, if the Japanese contrary to their expressed intention should plead ' military necessity ' for permanent occupation and fortification. Either base also threatens Hong Kong and French Indo-China. It is, however, difficult to see how this occupation of Hainan can advance very far any scheme that may be in hand for securing the hegemony of the Pacific ; if that were the object, it is enough to remark that the Japanese could take the island at any time. And if an attack were made upon the Philippines, beyond them lies the whole network of the Eastern Archipelago, including Borneo, the Celebes, Java and Sumatra, and stretching to within striking distance of the north coast of Australia.

There is little doubt that the ultimate aim of Japan is to oust the white races from their supremacy on the continent of Asia. The Japanese have no love for the foreigner, especially the foreigner who goes to Japan with the object of establishing a business. Nor, indeed, have

they much cause to love him. It was mainly owing to the meddlesomeness of foreigners, in particular the Jesuit missionaries, that the famous edict was issued in 1637 which closed Japan to all intercourse with the outer world until Perry arrived in 1853 and the cry of 'Restore the Emperor' in 1868 was coupled with the cry 'Expel the foreigner (or barbarian).' When Japan had established herself as the leading Far-Eastern Power, this slogan was expanded. Whereas originally the idea had been to get rid of the foreign pollution of the soil of Japan herself, the expulsion of the foreigner became the settled plan for a Pan-Asiatic policy. This policy is now the aim of the Japanese; it may not be directly avowed and it may be regarded as unrealisable unless in the remote future. Nor is it likely to be put in hand as a military adventure. At first, at any rate, it is a policy of 'squeeze.' Japanese enterprise is, by virtue of enactment and regulation, in those areas where they can be enforced, to elbow out the enterprise of the West and to capture the markets. It is of little use for Mr Arita, the Japanese Foreign Minister, to declare in the Japanese Diet, as he did on Jan. 21, 1939, that 'Japan desires the creation of a New East Asia upon an ethical foundation in which Japan, Manchukuo, and China, while each fully preserving her independence and individuality, will stand united and linked together for active collaboration and mutual aid along all lines of political, economic, and cultural activities.' For it is patent that so long as Japan is the overwhelmingly predominant partner she will mould these activities to suit herself and her own policy.

The British and American Identical Notes declared that those countries would not recognise a government established by force, and implicitly insisted on the 'Open Door' principle. On this point Mr Arita's speech was ambiguous. He spoke of 'restrictions and regulations in spheres having a vital bearing upon the national defence and economic independence of the three countries,' and of these spheres Japan will naturally be the judge. It is not difficult to read into these phrases an intention so to restrict foreign trade as virtually to create a Japanese monopoly, though he did add that 'these restrictions would be confined to minimum requirements.' In other words, Japan will profess to keep the door open, but

contrive to keep it no more than ajar. This policy will take time, for it is certain that Japan will not willingly provoke a conflict with the European Powers. But time does not matter. If these things cannot be done in a generation, let them take two or even three. The main point is to keep the aim steadily in view and also to keep the mailed fist well concealed in the velvet glove. The Japanese are no longer working on national but on continental lines. British, French, Americans, and the rest are the 'enemy,' not because of their nationalities but because they are Europeans or of European stock. Asia must belong to the Asiatic, and Japan alone in Asia can act as the Great Liberator. For if the barbarian can be forced to give up his trade, there can be no excuse for remaining there at all. Missionaries can be dealt with at leisure; so long as they do not interfere outside their own sphere, they are harmless; if they do so interfere they can be suppressed as has been done before. So much, indeed, Japan has openly avowed through her late Prime Minister, Prince Konoye. Meanwhile the army and navy must be kept at the maximum of efficiency, not only to meet the case of possible attack, which is unlikely, seeing that within her own sphere Japan is practically impregnable, but also to wage if necessary an aggressive war. She is quite capable, in her own vision at least, of emulating the deeds of Genghis Khan. The great deserts of Outer Mongolia and of Sinkiang are no longer as formidable as they were in the days of the great conqueror. Modern engineering science has robbed them of half their terrors, and the principal problem will be the furnishing of supplies. But the Japanese have already made a reputation for thorough preparation, and we may be sure that before she launches on an expedition so far from her base she will have thought out every minutest detail, if she has not already done so. It is then likely or at least possible that history will repeat itself. Just as the East India Company were compelled to expand their authority in India because of the hostility of their neighbours, so that conquest grew, as it were, by accretion, so the Japanese may be forced to extend their sway by the conquest or 'pacification' of the tribes first of Turkestan and then of Central Asia. That, at least, will furnish a good excuse for expansion. Will she stop there, or will

she be content with a southward advance and endeavour to oust France from Indo-China and Holland from the Dutch East Indies? That is a question which requires too keen a vision into the future to answer. There is no doubt that if she can force her way as far as, let us say, Kashgar—and there is nothing to stop her except the diplomacy and eventually the military power of Britain and Russia, who would by then, one may presume, have taken alarm at the prospect of such a gigantic Japanese Empire—she might penetrate to Bokhara and even cast covetous eyes on Persia.

To many people such an idea must seem fantastic. They will say that the military risks are too great and that Japan is primarily an agricultural country and could never stand the strain of such an effort as is contemplated. But she is already becoming industrial, and where industry is there is money. I do not suggest that she is capable of so large an effort within the next twenty years. Before every new spring forward is attempted, she will make sure that she can carry it out successfully; she will gradually become not only the most powerfully armed nation in the world—and she can accomplish this without much notice from others, if only from her geographical position—but also the most powerful economic people by reason of her trade. From her subject peoples she will be able to wring money—and will not hesitate to do so if it is a question of her own expansion. She will have command of important sources of raw material from which to supply her military necessities and of food to supplement her own supplies.

This programme depends upon two things. The first is the conquest of China. She cannot afford to push further into Asia until this is accomplished, for unless the people of China are 'pacified' or crushed, she could hardly dare to leave so formidable a hostile force in her rear. At present she has not advanced very far in the subjugation of the country, and her methods are not those which would inspire the confidence of the Chinese. If she does succeed it will be by force and it will be by force that she must hold the country. Secondly, she must be prepared to incur the bitter hostility of Russia. The forces of Russia are more or less an unknown quantity. We may make estimates of the potential man-power, but it is impossible to say what the quality is. We know that Russia is strong

on paper in her air force, but we do not know of what that force may be capable. Above all, it is difficult to forecast to what extent the Russian soldier is inspired by the enthusiastic patriotism which carried the ragged soldiers of the French Revolution to victory. At present, no doubt, Japan can rely upon Germany to immobilise a great part of the Russian army. As the English alliance was a great encouragement to her in the time of the Russian war, so the pact with Germany against Communist Russia is a great encouragement to a forward policy now. But treaties expire and pacts perish; Russia herself as time goes on may and probably will become stronger and stronger.

The threat to Europe itself is not great. Since the days of Attila Asiatics have never penetrated by force of arms further than the gates of Vienna, and it is in the highest degree unlikely that Japan, even backed by the trained man-power of a willing and subservient China, could ever get so far. Europe will not be so blind to her own interests as she was in the days of the last Byzantine Emperor. In the face of a really serious threat she would lay aside her own domestic or even international quarrels to combine against a common foe. But before that could happen, before the Japanese could invade Europe, all European domination in the East would have come to an end. Professor O'Conroy, who in his own words 'claims to be the greatest living authority on Japan in either hemisphere,' quotes at length the 'Tanaka Memorial' to the Throne, written in 1927. It is true, he says, that it is denounced by Japan as a forgery, but he adds that it is worthy of note because it outlines a policy which has been fulfilled to the letter. The Memorial says that:

'in order to conquer China we must first conquer Manchuria and Mongolia. If we succeed in conquering China, the rest of the Asiatic countries will realise that Eastern Asia is ours and will not dare to violate our rights. . . . Our best policy lies in the direction of taking some positive steps to secure rights and privileges in Manchuria and Mongolia. This will not only forestall China's industrial development but also prevent the penetration of European Powers. The way to gain rights in Manchuria and Mongolia is to use this region as a base and under the pretence of trade and commerce to penetrate the rest of China.'

'It is probably since the Korean annexation in 1910 that the dream of Eastern subjugation has been germinating in Japan,' remarks the Professor, 'and to-day this dream has grown into a colossal proposition of conquering the world.' We may not go as far as that, but there is little doubt that if Japan succeeds in conquering China, her ambition will not stop there. Comfortable folk in England may console themselves with the thought that Japan is far away, but unless she is checked they will one day realise that European trade and commerce and even European possessions have disappeared, at any rate from the Far East and possibly from Asia. That will not be now, probably not till the twenty-first century has dawned, but Europe must be awake to the possibilities, so that she may not one day open her eyes to be confronted with the *fait accompli*. It is not for nothing that the Japanese flag is the emblem of the Rising Sun.

STANLEY RICE.

# Art. 8.—THE ANATOMY OF INTELLIGENCE.

PERHAPS the most interesting by-product in the researches of the brain surgeon has been to establish a bit more precisely the areas of intelligence in the brain. Dr Walter E. Dandy, several years ago, was considerably dismayed to find that when the right half of the brain had been removed in a patient suffering from a massive brain tumour, there had been no deterioration of his mental powers. Similarly, Dr Richard M. Brickner and other surgeons have learned that removing the frontal lobes, or front portion of the brain did not result in any appreciable change in the patient's mental equipment. In fact, in several instances heroic brain surgery has resulted in increased mental acuity. For many years doctor and philosopher pondered the question as to whether one could really learn about brain power by taking the brain apart with the scalpel. Can the brain anatomist or brain surgeon tell us why some men are geniuses and others fools by noting certain peculiarities in brain architecture?

The first of the brain students was Dr Franz Gall, who was a most excellent anatomist, but unfortunately not a very clear thinker. He believed that slight elevations in the skull meant corresponding elevations of the underlying brain. After a great deal of elaboration he found that some twenty-six different bumps meant as many hyperdeveloped brain areas, with resultant superior attainments in as many different fields of thought. Later years proved that this was just so much nonsense; but in spite of this, phrenology became a practice with a vast following among quacks and practitioners of the shady arts. Dr Gall, however, did serve one useful purpose. He directed the attention of serious students to the brain. A clamour went up for more and better brains. It was a rather easy matter to obtain the brains of hospital patients who had died and had been subjected to an autopsy. But the brain anatomists were not satisfied with the brains of ordinary mortals. They wanted the brains of men of genius. Strange as it may seem, men of talent and even of genius were not averse to having their brains studied after death. Groups were formed among the intellectuals, whose members bequeathed their brains for study.

There was now a plentiful supply of all sorts of brains for the brain anatomists to study.

Now, felt the brain student, the opportunities were at hand to learn really the secret of brain power. The first study on the brains of men of genius and on those of men of ordinary achievement was undertaken in 1860 by Dr Rudolph Wagner. Dr Wagner was bequeathed the brains of three men of genius, the brain of Gauss, one of the greatest mathematicians who ever lived being among them. Dr Wagner undertook a very careful comparative study of the brain of Gauss, the mathematician, and the brain of Krebs, an ordinary day-labourer. After the most painstaking examination Dr Wagner could not find the slightest difference in the two brains. He studied the fissures of both brains ; he studied the depth of the convolutions, their number and pattern. He also compared the weights. They were practically identical in all respects. Quite frequently it has been found that the brain of an idiot weighs more than that of a man of superior talent. The brains of some of the really great have sometimes been very light in weight. The depth and number of convolutions are not more complicated in the brain of a man of talent than those of a moron.

A little later brain anatomists and surgeons began to study particular portions of the brain in an attempt to find the secret of brain power. The front portion of the brain was thought to be that part of the brain in which the higher faculties were located. For a while this was preached as gospel truth. But a careful study of the frontal lobes of the brains of the eminent psychologist and university president, G. Stanley Hall, and one of the world-famous physician, Sir William Osler, and a comparison with the frontal lobes of men of ordinary mental endowment revealed no essential differences. Further, the experiences of brain surgeons proved that when even a large portion of the frontal lobe had been destroyed by disease the patient did not suffer a great deal of mental upheaval.

For many years brain anatomists despaired of ever finding a physical basis for intelligence. A great many studies had been made on weight, depth of fissure, pattern of convolution, but no notable differences had been discovered. It was not possible for a brain student to take two brains, one that of a man of genius and the other that

of an illiterate day-labourer, and tell them apart. One fact, and a most important one, finally dawned upon the consciousness of the brain student. He realised that he was studying the brains of dead men, machines which no longer functioned. One cannot learn very much about the efficiency of a machine when the machine is at rest. A larger and more powerfully constructed machine is not necessarily a more efficient one. The machine in motion really tells the story. What is the source of power? How well is potential energy converted into living energy? Gasoline may be a more efficient fuel for certain types of engines than steam or oil.

What is the driving power of the brain—the fuel, so to speak, which kindles thought? The answer is simple, as every student of body mechanics knows. It is the blood supply. The blood nourishes the brain. The blood supply of the brain tells the story of brain power more completely than do the most painstaking studies of the dead grey and white matter that go into the making of the brain. Dr Henry Donaldson, a most excellent brain anatomist, has well said: 'The best of brains make a poor showing in a fainting individual.' During fainting and death the brain is drained of blood as well as of power. The most serious mistake the early brain anatomists made when studying the brain was to remove and discard the brain coverings. And yet it was not the brain itself but the membranes which covered the brain that had a most significant story to tell. The brain coverings contain the arteries and veins that nourish the brain, and a study of the size and complexity of these arteries tell us more about brain power than the size, weight, and complexity of the brain structure itself.

The first real discovery of the secret of superior brain power was made by Dr Hindzie, in 1926; who devoted special attention to the blood supply of the brain coverings of those of superior mental powers and those of ordinary mental ability. He began to find real differences. He found that the blood supply of the brain coverings of those of superior mental endowment was richer and more complex. From a careful study of the blood supply to the brain one can now definitely state whether the brain was that of a man of talent or that of a moron. For the first time the brain anatomist has at least a partial answer as to

what brain power depends upon. He knows that it does not depend upon the weight of the brain nor the complexity of its make-up. It depends a great deal on the amount of blood supplied to the brain. The more generous the blood supply the greater the mental abilities. The brain coverings of men of genius have blood vessels of magnificent calibre and are rich in the supply of these conduits of blood. The half-wit, on the other hand, has a brain covering poor in blood vessels and these are of a constricted calibre. Another important point which the surgeons in their explorations of the brain discovered is that the composition of the blood itself plays a very important rôle in fostering intelligence. The amount of sugar, of lime, and of other important elements is of the utmost importance. It is believed that mental processes may be controlled by the character of the blood stream. The architecture of the brain cell depends not only upon the amount of blood brought to it but also upon the quality of the blood.

A careful study of the amounts of lime in the blood in the various types of mental illness by Doctors Solomon Katzenelbogen and Harry Goldsmith has brought some very interesting facts to light. Most cases of insanity of an organic origin usually have a smaller lime content of the blood than those that are normal. Lime is but one factor, and the whole story cannot be based on lime alone. Doctors Katzenelbogen and Friedman-Buchman have studied the amounts of sugar in various cases of mental disturbance and have also found something of interest in this connection. In the majority of cases of insanity the amount of blood sugar is usually increased above normal limits. This is particularly true of split-personality insanity. The higher the blood sugar the higher the nervous tension of the individual. It thus appears that the abnormally sweet brain is a crazy brain.

Speculating upon the chemical basis of intelligence, Dr William Healy, a psychiatrist who is also an original thinker, has suggested that hormones (those chemical products of the ductless glands) may turn the ordinary brain into a superior brain. Citing studies of the blood stream as it enters and leaves the brain, and testing the effects of a new drug, Dr Healy said: 'The extraordinary energy-stimulating powers of benzedrine sulphate appear

to prove that the potential of the brain cells is far from realised under ordinary conditions of nutrition or stimulation by what the blood stream has to offer.' Continuing his speculations, Dr. Healy remarked: 'One is led to think of what we might achieve if only through feeding our cerebral tissues with better harmonic and other activating materials we could realise the full working powers of what we already have.' It seems that we are still a long way off from the time when we will be able to improve mental power by altering the chemical make-up of the blood stream that feeds the brain. But certain are we that the amount of blood and the quality of the blood that feeds the brain has a great deal to do with intelligence.

Along these lines Doctors William Sargant and J. M. Blackburn have been conducting some interesting experiments at Maudsley Hospital in London. They found that by using a drug called benzedrine they were able to quicken mental responses in a series of 67 hospital patients. While it is extremely unlikely that any drug can have the effect of increasing innate intelligence, benzedrine did exert some remarkable effects in those who were given this drug. Two groups were given the Cattell intelligence tests, one group being given pills made from benzedrine and the other, the control group, being given pills similar in appearance, but containing no active elements. The drug takers got 8.7 per cent. higher scores while working under the influence of the mental stimulant. This supports the claims made by those who believe that the quality of the blood supplying the brain has a great deal to do with intelligence. The chemistry of intelligence is a most fascinating study.

Within recent years the desire to learn something about the brain in action has led to the perfection of an electrical device to measure brain activity. For a great many years it has been known that everything that lives is capable of producing a minute electric current. The first man to become aware of the fact that the brain also produces electricity was a German, Dr Fleischle von Marxow, who in 1890 with a rather crude machine of his own making actually detected faint electrical impulses through the heads of various animals. Dr von Marxow had made his discovery too soon; it had to wait almost forty years to bring it up to its present perfection. The

development of the vacuum tube certainly had a great deal to do with it, for there is nothing quite like this device to step up feeble electrical energy so that it can actually be seen and studied. Where Dr von Marxow left off, another German, Dr Hans Berger, at the University of Jena, took up. He began to tap the electrical energy of the brain under all sorts of conditions, with patients who were hot or cold, asleep or awake, excited or relaxed. He went into the operating rooms of his colleagues at the hospitals and placed electrodes directly on the brain through small openings in the skull. He obtained the brain wave tracings of geniuses and morons, and in one interesting experiment he actually got an electrical picture of a brain that had lost consciousness.

In the United States physicians whose domain is the brain and its functions evinced a great interest in the work of these German pioneers, and they began to carry on their researches. To measure the electrical activity of the brain is quite simple. The subject has one arm carefully scrubbed with soap and water, then washed with alcohol to remove all skin oils. Then strips of cloth saturated with a salt solution are wrapped around the arm to keep the electrodes pressed against the skin at the wrist and on the forearm. A white turban which contains the silver head electrode is then wrapped around the head to keep these electrodes in close contact with the scalp. Wires connect these electrodes to a machine which measures and amplifies the electrical current produced by the brain and records these waves on strips of paper.

These electrical tapplings of the brain have given us a very interesting insight into how the brain functions. During his researches Dr Berger discovered that brain waves fall into two general groups, the alpha rhythm, with approximately ten fluctuations a second, and the beta rhythm, with twenty or more a second. Normally these waves remain approximately the same day after day. But when things begin to happen to the brain these electrical waves show it. Thus, during an epileptic fit there is a great piling up of electrical energy within the brain and the flow of electrical energy from the brain increases as much as 3,000 per cent. over the normal. On the other hand, when a person faints and loses consciousness the brain waves slow down from three to five

a second, but the voltage rises to more than double the normal. The harder the brain works the more electrical energy it gives out. It has been found that working a difficult mathematical problem involves a great deal of electrical energy. Also memorising a sentence results in a greater display of electrical fireworks by the brain than simply reading it.

Dr Donald B. Lindsley of the Brush Foundation and Western Reserve University has learned some interesting facts about how the brain works by employing the electroencephalograph, as this measuring device is known. He found that babies begin to think at the age of three months. In infants, the significant alpha waves (the thinking waves) first appear at this age. Before that, the brain recordings show either a complete absence of electrical activity of the brain or small grossly irregular beta waves oscillating at the rate of from 25 to 40 per second. Occasionally a single wave of alpha magnitude appears in infants under three months of age; but rhythmic frequency of alpha waves (visible evidence of the brain thinking) does not appear until the third month. Since infants begin to perceive objects and follow them with their eyes at about this same age, it is quite evident that the human brain awakens to functional activity at the early age of three months.

What happens after that? Dr Lindsley has found that the pattern of the alpha waves (thinking waves) improves in frequency, amplitude, and rhythm with age, until the adult level is reached at 8 to 10 years. For some reason the frequency is increased over the adult levels during the 10 to 12 age period. Dr Lindsley is of the opinion that this rise in frequency is related to some of the many physiological changes which are believed to occur between the ages of 10 to 12.

A somewhat disconcerting discovery, so far as men are concerned, is that women think faster than men. The principal criteria in judging the functional activity of the brain by means of its electrical effects are: (1) the frequency; (2) amplitude; and (3) the rhythm of the brain waves which appear on the film strip. In women Dr Lindsley found the average frequency of the alpha waves was 11 per second, in men 10.2 per second. Hence the deduction that women think faster. Another interest-

ing thing about brain waves is that they are individual for each person, almost as individual as fingerprints. It has been suggested that in the future brain waves of criminals may be made to be kept on file as are fingerprints at the present time. This interesting possibility has been worked out by Professor Lee Edward Travis at Iowa State University. He made a series of brain wave tracings of 44 healthy students. Each student had brain waves of very marked individuality as far as frequency, form, and amplitude of the waves are concerned. Successive pictures of the contour of the brain always matched each individual student. It shows that each individual has his own technic of thinking.

The behaviour of the brain during abnormal function is most interesting. Epilepsy has yielded many secrets through electrical tapping of the brain. Thus, in minor epilepsy, just before and during an attack the brain waves come about every three seconds in a strange pattern of large round waves with a spiky wave between the round ones. In major epilepsy, both fast and slow waves of much greater than normal voltage are found. Even more important, the disturbance in brain activity as shown by these tracings of the electrical waves from the brain goes on even when the epileptic patient is not having a fit or seizure and is in one of his apparently normal periods. These changes probably hold the clue as to what is going on in the brain at the time of a seizure, and if they find just what the waves mean in terms of nervous activity, brain specialists believe they may be able to find out just what an epileptic seizure is and how it starts.

This accumulation of evidence on the electrical activity of the brain is yielding some very interesting knowledge in regard to brain function. Unconsciousness is now better understood on the basis of electrical energy. Thus unconsciousness is simply a lack of electrons in the cortex of the brain. More technically, it is a drop of electrical potential in the brain for the reason that electrons (negative charges of electricity) are leaving the brain via the motor nerves faster than they are coming in over the sensory nerves.

The best way to study unconsciousness is to induce it by means of anæsthetics. General anæsthetics, which are known to act on the brain, upset the balance of its

electrical potential and permit electrons to escape from the brain faster than they are arriving there. These are the interesting conclusions of Doctors W. E. Burge, G. C. Wickwire, and H. M. Schamp of the University of Illinois. They summarise their findings as follows : ' If the balance of the electrical potential of the brain is in favour of negative charges leaving the brain, increased positive potential of the brain, inactivity, and unconsciousness result. It would seem that cortical activity would be a matter of electrical potential, the actively conscious cortex being electro-negative and the inactive unconscious cortex being electro-positive.'

Brain students are now getting a clear picture of what constitutes intelligence. Certain are they that intelligence depends not upon the size or weight of the brain, as hitherto believed, but upon the amount of blood furnished the brain, the quality of the blood as influenced by internal and external chemical changes, which may also have something to do with the electrical energy of the brain.

EDWARD PODOLSKY, M.D.,  
of Brooklyn, N.Y.

## Art. 9.—RUMANIA.

'UN flot latin au milieu de l'océan slave et finnois qui l'environne,' so Baron Jean de Witte described Rumania more than a generation ago, and the passage of time has certainly done nothing to affect the truth of this statement. It would, of course, be absurd to claim that the Rumanian race is of pure Latin stock, and in some parts of the kingdom there are large racial minorities of very different origin, but no one can be in the country for twenty-four hours without realising that in all the essentials of civilisation it is Latin. It is by no means difficult to pick more than one hole in an argument of this nature, but even so it can hardly be denied that it is in the memory of Imperial Rome that the Rumanians have for generations sought their inspiration.

This fact has coloured the whole of the national history. 'People,' wrote Burke, 'will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors,' and although there have been moments in the careers of all the Danubian and Balkan countries when their consciousness of the past has become a trifle exaggerated, still it is in the main a fault on the right side. During centuries of subjection to Turk, Magyar, Slav, and German, when their land, then simply known to the statesmen of Europe as the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, was little more than a manœuvre-area for foreign armies, the Rumanians survived as a national entity very largely owing to this belief in a Latin origin which separated them from and culturally raised them above their conquerors of the moment. The ethnologist may smile, but at bottom it is this conviction that has enabled the Rumanian race to survive.

Not unnaturally, the consequence of this has been that in every aspect of life save the religious the Rumanians have looked for guidance to the great centres of Latin civilisation, and in particular to Paris. The French capital became the Mecca of every Rumanian who could afford to go there, and French fashions, French literature, and French manners were predominant in Moldavia and Wallachia while the Principalities were still nominally subject to the Sublime Porte and long before they were united in one state. Unhappily, there was another side

to this picture. The great Phanariote families who then governed the Principalities imported into their own country only too often the vices as well as the virtues which they found in Paris, and this by no means redounded to the ultimate credit either of themselves or of their fellow-countrymen. Still, the consequences were on the whole beneficial, and while his neighbours were either modelling themselves on Russia or thanking God that they were not as other men are, the Rumanian was at least in spiritual contact with Western Europe and with the progressive ideas to be found, at that time, there alone. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that the Rumanian nation has been held together solely by its common Latin origin, for there is another bond of great strength, namely the memory of Michael the Brave and of his success in re-uniting, if only for a brief space, all the Rumanian people under his rule at the close of the sixteenth century. In the dark ages that followed, Moldavian and Wallachian, inhabitants of Transylvania, and of the Banat of Temesvar, all looked back to the victories of Michael as a guarantee that they had a national destiny, and they awaited the day, which came at the end of the Great War, when there would once again be a Rumanian monarch ruling over all Rumanians.

Unless this background is appreciated it is impossible to understand modern Rumania. Too little is often known in English-speaking countries of the age-old national traditions of those kingdoms which have grown up on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire; and in consequence it is assumed that they are mere mushroom creations. Nothing could be further from the truth, for they all have roots going back into the remote past. Leaving on one side the Greeks, whose history was for so long that of civilization itself, the present King of the Bulgarians, Boris III, owes his name to a Bulgarian ruler of the ninth century, of whose kingdom his own claims to be the heir; Albania is one of the newest of kingdoms but King Zog is entitled to assert that he is only carrying on the work of Scanderbeg five hundred years ago; while the Serbian subjects of King Peter II recall with pride the Nemanya dynasty, which brought the blessings of law and order to their ancestors about the same time that the Angevins were pursuing a similar policy in

England. For these reasons the Rumanian, the Bulgarian, the Albanian, or the Serb tends to look at his problems from a different angle from that which the Anglo-Saxon imagines, for the latter probably never heard of him until yesterday, and therefore assumes that prior to this he did not exist.

The effects, too, moral as well as material, of the long Turkish domination are rarely sufficiently taken into account. At first the Rumanians did not suffer as much as some of their neighbours. Wallachia was reduced to vassaldom by the Turks in 1412 and Moldavia a century later, but although both Principalities were compelled to pay tribute to the Sultan, they were for a time allowed to elect their own rulers. Occasionally, as we have seen in the case of Michael the Brave, they were even able to maintain a precarious independence. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, however, Ahmed III, whose hand was very heavy on the Principalities, deprived them of the privilege of election, and the two hospodars were put up by the Porte for auction, and were invariably knocked down to Phanariote Greeks. To quote Sir John Marriott's classic work 'The Eastern Question':

'For one hundred and ten years, therefore, Moldavia and Wallachia were ruled by a rapid succession of Greek bureaucrats. The more rapid the succession the better for the Turk. Consequently each hospodar, knowing that his tenure would be brief, had perforce to make hay while the sun shone, and the system was . . . neither more nor less than organised brigandage.'

During this period there were thirty-seven hospodars in Wallachia and thirty-three in Moldavia. When the moral degeneracy inevitable under such a régime is taken into account, some conception may be gained of the task which has had to be faced by the creators of modern Rumania, and not least by King Carol II. It was well for them that they had the twin memories of Imperial Rome and of Michael the Brave to which they could appeal.

All the territories inhabited by Rumanians did not, however, remain under Turkish rule: had such been the case the Greater Rumania of to-day might have come into

existence before 1918. Indeed, as the Ottoman power declined the prospects of Rumanian unity positively suffered. By the Treaty of Carlowitz in 1699 the Habsburgs obtained Transylvania; and at Passarowitz, nineteen years later, they received the Banat of Temesvar. In 1775 they further acquired the Bukovina. The overthrow of the empire of Austria-Hungary as well as that of the Sultans was thus an essential preliminary to the reunion of the Rumanian race. That this should have been the case was a definite misfortune for Central Europe as a whole and even for Rumania herself. The disappearance of Austria-Hungary in the long run brought the German Reich directly into Rumanian politics.

As in the case of so many of the countries which achieved their independence during the course of the nineteenth century, there was in Rumania a reaction once the immediate struggle was at an end. The Constitution, which was originally enacted in 1866, was of a very liberal nature, but it was honoured rather in the breach than in the observance, and the country was ruled, relatively not too badly, by the Bratiano family. Almost wholly agricultural, Rumania lacked leaders, and it must be confessed that those who should have led mostly failed to realise their responsibilities. Down to the Great War the habit of the larger landowners, who were mainly of Phanariote descent, was to raise in the spring all the money they could on the forthcoming harvest, and then go to Paris, where they remained until it was spent. Indeed, a bank could show quite a reasonable profit with a mere forty or fifty of such clients. These magnates were little use to their country at home and they gave her a bad name abroad. Meanwhile, Rumanian politics remained a by-word of corruption, and the standard of public life sank as low as it could.

The War revolutionised Rumania, and most of the difficulties which she has experienced during the past twenty years have arisen from the necessity of adapting herself to the changed conditions created by it. In the first place the big estates were broken up, and this step, although always of doubtful utility from a purely agricultural point of view, prevented the spread of Bolshevism from Russia. Then, at last, the empire of Michael the Brave was re-created, and Rumania became by a stroke of

the pen one of the leading states of the second rank. Unfortunately, however, these large accessions of territory transferred to her rule contained members of other races, especially Hungarians, who were destined to give a great deal of trouble. Rumania, as has been shown, was notably deficient in competent administrators, and the result was that the problem of the minorities was far from tactfully handled. The fact that when the Magyars, in Habsburg times, had themselves been in the ascendant they had been by no means easy masters to the Rumanians in Transylvania and the Banat did not make them any more patient when the position was reversed. In this connection the break-up of the large estates cannot be ignored, for in the newly acquired provinces it has involved the transfer of land from foreigners to Rumanians, and has thus had a national as well as a social implication.

This is not the place for an account, however brief, of the political struggles of the post-war years, but one consideration does arise from them, and it is the place of the Crown in Rumanian life. King Carol I and his nephew, King Ferdinand, were very different types, but they were both extremely competent monarchs. When the former was offered the throne, Bismarck urged him to accept, 'if only for the sake of a piquant adventure,' and that the Iron Chancellor's jest did not become a reality was due to the ability of the King. Neither of the first two Hohenzollern sovereigns of Rumania played a decisive part in the country's domestic politics, nor was it necessary that they should, but they established the monarchy upon a very sound basis, and when the time came for King Carol II to govern as well as to reign, it was to his predecessors that he owed the fact that he was in a position to do so. In character, it may be added, the present sovereign recalls his mother rather than his father, King Ferdinand, who was of a retiring disposition.

In Rumania, therefore, hereditary kingship has fulfilled its historic part of representing the national interest at a time when the centrifugal forces had become so strong as to threaten the very unity of the nation, which was the position when King Carol II personally assumed control of its destinies, and to-day it is the dominant factor. It is too early yet to say whether the King will succeed in his task of making his country into a modern

state, but it can at least be said that if he fails then the attempt is indeed hopeless. His energy is remarkable, and in no branch of the administration can there be any doubt whence the driving-force is derived. The numerous portraits of the King and of the Crown Prince which meet the eye in the provinces as well as in the capital are evidence not only of loyalty to the throne but of a very wholesome respect for its present occupant. The atmosphere in Rumania now is that of France immediately after the death of Mazarin, when Louis XIV took over the reins of government and everything derived from the throne.

The King has already accomplished a great deal. It is easy to say that the new Rumania is a mere façade, but that is far from being the whole story, and the façade itself is distinctly impressive. In all departments of the national life there is activity. New roads are being constructed, fine public buildings are being erected, and every effort is being made to create a native film industry. Much that is being attempted recalls modern Italy and Germany, but with this difference, there is in Rumania no Fascist or Nazi Party through which the Government can act. This means, of course, that it cannot act so quickly, but it also means that persuasion necessarily plays a greater part in official schemes, and in the long run this must prove an advantage.

Somehow, too, the King has persuaded the ordinary Rumanian to become an optimist, and as a result the prevailing tone is decidedly cheerful. While in neighbouring countries the universal tendency is to talk in hushed whispers of the next move of the dictators, in Rumania there is a growing determination amongst all classes to work out their own salvation. It is not an aggressive spirit, but it is certainly one which those who covet Rumanian territory would do well to take into account. The old vices, a legacy of the Turk, still flourish, and it will be long before they are eradicated, but Rumania is no longer sunk in sleep, and that she is every day becoming more alive to her possibilities is due to her truly remarkable King.

In these days it is rarely possible in the case of a Continental Power to disentangle foreign and domestic problems, and, unhappily for herself, Rumania is no

exception. It has been mentioned above that the gains which resulted from the Great War proved difficult of assimilation, and this was very largely because the Magyar minority in Transylvania always had its gaze directed to Budapest rather than to Bucharest. It has, unlike the Saxons, refused to co-operate with its Rumanian rulers, and secretly cherishes the hope that one day it may be reunited with Hungary. Recent events in Czecho-Slovakia have greatly encouraged this aspiration, and the return of Kassa to the Crown of St Stephen is regarded in many quarters as a precedent which may one day be followed in the case of Kolozsvár, the Rumanian Cluj. Of late the situation has been still further complicated by the adherence of Hungary to the anti-Comintern Pact and by the fact that she has now sunk to the position of a German vassal. Rumanians are wondering how much of their country was promised to Budapest as the reward for unquestioning adherence to the policy of the Reich.

It is not, however, only in regard to the Hungarian minority in Transylvania that these pre-occupations exist. By the Treaty of Bucharest, in 1913, Rumania received from the Bulgars, defeated in the Second Balkan War, the Dobrudja, together with Silistria, and ever since there has been a section of opinion in Sofia which has intrigued to recover this territory. Had the Central Powers won the Great War the Dobrudja was to have been restored to Bulgaria, and its loss still rankles. King Boris does all he can to live at peace with his neighbours, but the extremists chafe at his policy of moderation. Last November there were demonstrations in Sofia to demand the return of the Dobrudja, and during the course of them the swastika was painted on the wall of the French Legation. It is thus small wonder that the Rumanians are speculating on the possibility of their racial minorities being stirred up to suit the policy of Herr Hitler, many of whose advisers view with no favour the close ties that bind King Carol to England.

It is not easy to decide what part, if any, the Iron Guard plays in the undoubted German attempt to force Rumania into dependence upon the Rome-Berlin axis. No evidence of complicity on the part of the Reich has yet been forthcoming, and it may well be that the Iron Guard organisation requires no stimulus from without.

In origin it was little more than a movement for the regeneration of Rumania, though it always demanded strong measures against the Jews, who are particularly numerous in Moldavia. At that time it was supported by the clergy, and the greater part of its adherents were patriotic citizens who saw no hope in the existing political system. Its subsequent deterioration was largely due to the fact that it failed to produce a capable leader, for Codreano was little more than a gangster, and so the extremists obtained control. When these commenced murdering their opponents in hospital, the moderate element left in disgust, and the Iron Guard sank to its present condition of a purely terrorist organisation.

King Carol has very cleverly appropriated to his own use so much of its programme as was practicable, and this has by no means recommended him to its leaders, who would now certainly not stop at regicide. It is difficult to say how strong the Iron Guard is at the present time, for it has been driven underground; but the frequency with which outrages of one sort or another are committed would seem to show that it is more widely spread than is officially admitted. At the same time there can be no compromise if law and order in Rumania are to be maintained. The atrocities of the Iron Guard are of a particularly revolting type. One of the most representative was the shooting of the Rector of Cluj University last November. An extremely capable man, to whom the university owes a great deal of its prosperity, he was shot in the back from behind a hoarding one foggy morning while he was walking through the streets of that extremely attractive Transylvanian town. Rumanian politics have never been on any exalted plane, but until the appearance of the Iron Guard they have been relatively free from violence, which is not in the national character. It is thus all the more desirable that a new tradition of political assassination should not be allowed to take root.

These various considerations render more difficult a settlement of the problem of the minorities since it is connected with other questions. Whatever hopes may be cherished in Sofia or Budapest, any such settlement will have to be within the framework of the existing Rumanian state, for only defeat in war would induce Rumania to cede any of the national territory, a fact which most

Hungarians, if left to themselves, would now be prepared to admit. One of the major difficulties of administration is that the minorities are scattered. In Transylvania, for example, the Magyars represent about a quarter of the total population, but they fall into two distinct groups—the Szeklers, and the Magyars in the rest of the province. The Szeklers inhabit the departments of Odorhei, Ciuc, and Trei Scaune, where they constitute an overwhelming majority of the population, and part of the departments of Mures, Brasov, and Tarnava-Mica. This group, which lives in the immediate vicinity of the old Rumanian frontier and is surrounded on all sides by a compact Rumanian population, comprises 42.2 per cent. of the total Magyar population of Transylvania. The second group is formed by the Magyars who live scattered throughout the other departments, but without forming a majority in any one of them. There is also a German minority which represents 9.8 per cent. of the total population of the province: these people are known as Saxons, but they are really of Rhineland origin and came into Transylvania in the days of the Saxon Emperors. It is even said that the legend of the Pied Piper of Hamelin refers to their migration. They too are not wholly concentrated in any one area. In these circumstances, perhaps the best solution would be the creation of a special régime for Transylvania directly under the Crown. In the old days of Parliamentary Government this would have presented many difficulties, but under an absolute monarchy it should be easier to effect, more especially as a new Constitution is to be promulgated in the near future.

The Bulgarian minority, which numbers about 300,000, is mostly to be found in the Dobrudja, where, however, there are also a quantity of Rumanians, Turks, Tartars, Turkish-speaking Gagauzes, and members of other races. Special rule for such an area is probably out of the question, but an exchange of population might be effected in view of the fact that there is also a Rumanian minority in Bulgaria. On the other hand, delay would in either case be dangerous, for the minorities have kinsmen elsewhere, and propaganda of the type which was so successful in the Sudeten area of Czecho-Slovakia is a distinct possibility.

What is not generally realised in Western Europe is

that, given stable political conditions Rumania is possessed of resources which should enable her to enjoy a prosperous future. Eighty per cent. of her population of twenty million is on the land, mostly as peasant proprietors, and three-fifths of the country is under cultivation, which is a high ratio when its configuration is taken into account. When the big estates were first broken up there was a fall in production, but this has now been arrested. Maize is the chief crop, and Rumania is, after Argentina, the largest maize-exporting country in the world. King Carol is paying great attention to agriculture in all its branches, and of late years there has been a considerable development in stock-raising, notably in sheep-breeding in Bessarabia. Fruit is also being cultivated on an increasingly extensive scale for the foreign market, but one feels that more might be done with the really excellent Rumanian wines, which are so little drunk outside their own country.

The wealth of Rumania in raw materials is better appreciated abroad, and she is only really dependent on the outside world for iron, rubber, and cotton, of which commodities, it may be noted, the last two can be supplied by the Western Powers or the United States alone. The oil-fields cause envious eyes to be cast upon Rumania, and in the past there was a good deal of domestic waste of this fuel; measures, however, are now being taken to husband resources in this connection, for 17,000 acres are already exhausted. This industry has another importance in that of the capital invested in it no less than 80 per cent. is foreign. These facts are by no means without their significance in matters of foreign policy, for the oil is largely exported from Constanza, so that the rulers of Rumania are fully alive to the necessity of friendship with the Powers predominant at sea.

Many misapprehensions exist about the Rumanian people. Enough has already been said to show that they are not the lazy, lotus-eating race of Western imagination. As soldiers they had little chance, owing to most indifferent leadership, of showing what they could do in the Great War, but they fought well against the Turks at Plevna. They are taking to sport, for King Carol has copied Italy and Germany in its official encouragement, as well as in some other matters, and a very fine stadium has been built in Bucharest. In the provincial centres the

same spirit is at work, and every care is taken that there are ample opportunities for exercise. On all hands there is evidence of a desire for progress and a determination to show that Rumania is worthy of her destiny.

It is extremely satisfactory to find Great Britain playing a large part in the reawakening of the country. The new British Institute in Bucharest was opened by Lord Lloyd, the chairman of the British Council, last October, but the Anglo-Rumanian Society has been holding English classes for some eleven years. The Institute now has about 1000 pupils, and the accommodation available is being so severely taxed that a new building is to be erected. The British Council is also arranging for regular visits by lecturers whose task it is to keep the Rumanian public, both in the capital and in the provinces, in touch with the thought and material activities of Great Britain. Their lectures are invariably well attended, and are conclusive evidence of the interest taken, particularly by the younger generation, in all things British. Indeed, it would not be too much to say that if the present interest in the English language is maintained, it will in a very few years have displaced French as the most widely understood foreign tongue in Rumania.

These developments are by no means unconnected with the general position of Rumania in Europe. Until very recently her foreign policy was based upon her membership of the League of Nations and of the Little Entente: as one of the victors in the Great War she naturally wished for the preservation of the status quo, of which Geneva seemed to be the guarantee, and in particular she desired to guard against any revival of Hungary which might threaten her newly incorporated territories. It must be admitted that until King Carol II personally assumed control of his country's foreign policy it was very badly directed, and M. Titulesco in particular has much for which to answer. For years he was one of the dominant influences in the Little Entente, and it is very largely to him that Rumania owes the fact that she now has the Third Reich at her door. The policy of the Little Entente was, mainly owing to the pressure of M. Benes, negative, that is to say it was directed against the return of the Habsburgs to Vienna, and so obsessed were its statesmen with the imaginary dangers which would result from

the restoration of the Archduke Otto that all they succeeded in doing was to pave the way for the German rape of Austria. In fairness to King Carol it must be stated that he was aware of the perils of this course, but for some years after he regained his throne in such dramatic circumstances in 1930 he had to proceed extremely warily, and by the time he was in full control it was already too late to undo the harm caused by M. Titulesco. To-day the Little Entente hardly exists even in name, and the changed conditions in Central Europe have forced Rumania to seek fresh allies.

At the present time she is being subjected to enormous pressure to adhere to the Rome-Berlin axis, and she is resisting this pressure with very great courage. Possible German interest in the claims of Bulgaria and Hungary and in the Iron Guard has already been discussed, and Berlin is neglecting no effort to isolate Rumania so as to compel her to come within the German orbit. Rumanian opinion firmly believes that the object of Herr Hitler's diplomacy in Eastern Europe is to regain the position won by the Treaties of Brest Litovsk and Bucharest (1918), and subsequently abandoned owing to defeat in the West. In any such scheme the Rumanian oil-fields must play a big part, and in this the Rumanians see both danger and hope; danger because it may render their country the object of attack, and hope because they do not believe that the Western Powers would stand aside and see the oil-fields pass under German control.

A few months ago there seemed a possibility of the formation of a *bloc* consisting of Rumania, Poland, Hungary, and Yugo-Slavia to resist any further German advance to the south-east, but the defection of Hungary and the uncertain attitude of Poland have now rendered any such combination more problematical. Perhaps the most brilliant stroke of Nazi diplomacy was the refusal, in the circumstances then existing and in spite of the wishes of Rome, to consider a common frontier between Hungary and Poland. By this means Hungary was frightened into subservience, and Poland, doubtful about her relations with both Berlin and Moscow, cooled almost over-night in her attitude towards Bucharest and Belgrade. In effect, the policy adopted by Germany towards the proposed common Polish-Hungarian frontier was in the

true Bismarckian tradition, that is to say that it prevented any combination of Powers hostile to German ambitions by sowing dissensions among them. King Carol very quickly perceived this; indeed, there are signs that he had anticipated some such development; and he at once set to work to prevent any isolation of his country.

Rumania is to-day more closely linked with Yugo-Slavia than with any other of her neighbours. They are partners in the moribund Little Entente and their ruling dynasties are intimately related, since King Carol's sister is Queen-Mother of Yugo-Slavia. Of late, too, there have been signs that Belgrade is becoming increasingly apprehensive of German intentions, a state of mind which is not unaffected by the fact that King Peter numbers at least 650,000 of Herr Hitler's fellow-countrymen among his subjects. Relations with Italy are dependent upon those with Germany, and the Prince Regent knows quite well that the mass of the people still regard the Western Powers with more sympathy than they do the Rome-Berlin axis. For this reason the Rumanian alliance is popular in Yugo-Slavia, and at the end of August last year the two countries decided to raise their respective Legations to the rank of Embassies.

They are further connected by their membership of the Balkan Entente, which also includes Greece and Turkey. The Balkan Pact was originally signed at Athens in February 1934, and it has recently been renewed for a further indefinite period. The Little Entente collapsed in no small measure owing to the rigidity of its policy, dictated by Prague, while the Balkan Entente has pursued more realistic aims. On July 31, 1938, there was signed the Salonika Agreement by which the Bulgarians were allowed to re-arm and also to fortify the demilitarised zone on her Thracian frontier. Rumania concurred in this, although Bulgaria refused to join the Balkan Entente, whose members are pledged to assist one another should any attempt be made to change existing frontiers. In this connection it was pointed out in Sofia that Bulgaria had by no means abandoned her territorial aspirations. The pacific policy of King Boris was largely responsible for the fact that the Balkan Entente took the risk of allowing Bulgaria to re-arm without exacting a recognition of the status quo, but it was also felt, especially in

Rumania, that in no event was Sofia likely to commit any aggressive act without encouragement from elsewhere.

The good will thus engendered was further exemplified a few weeks later, when Rumania recovered full sovereignty of the mouth of the Danube. The Peace Treaties placed the navigable section of this river, between Ulm and Braila, under the control of an International Commission, just as the section between Braila and the Black Sea had been administered by the European Commission since the Treaty of Paris which terminated the Crimean War. There was, however, a difference between the authority of the two bodies, as well as between their composition. The International Commission includes the representatives of the riparian states as well as of Great Britain, France, and Italy, while the European Commission of the Danube is composed of the delegates of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Rumania, but whereas the former merely ensured the freedom of navigation for the vessels of all nations, leaving the river itself under the sovereignty of the riparian states, the latter practically took the control of the mouth of the Danube out of the hands of Rumania, so that even the regulation of navigation, together with the administration of customs and charges, came within its scope.

Successive Rumanian administrations had, as may be supposed, chafed under these restrictions, though they had loyally observed them, but when Germany repudiated, in a characteristically unilateral manner, the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles which gave the control of the Danube, Rhine, Elbe, and Oder to the International Commission, Rumania felt that she might justly claim relief from the restrictions imposed by the European Commission. On Aug. 8, 1938, therefore, the delegates of Great Britain, France, and Rumania (Italy was not represented) met, and eleven days later an agreement was published which abolished all treaty obligations incompatible with the sovereign rights of Rumania. The territorial attributes of the Commission were transferred to the Rumanian Government, which is henceforth to exercise control over the river, and the international character of the port of Sulina was abolished. In theory the European Commission still exists, but it cannot challenge the measures of Bucharest, and the only function which remains to it is

to fix dues and charges, though even these are now levied by Rumania.

It can thus be justly claimed that Rumania has honoured her international obligations, and has not descended to unilateral abrogation of agreements. She feels that this entitles her to the sympathy and support of the Western Powers. On the extent to which she receives this sympathy and support depends her resistance to the pressure of the axis states. The success achieved by the British Institute in Bucharest is eloquent of the position of Great Britain throughout the country. Few royal visits of recent years have attracted as much attention as that of King Carol to London last autumn, and the gratitude felt in Rumania at his reception has to be experienced to be believed. It would, of course, be foolish to deny that such gratitude is to no small extent in the nature of expectation of favours to come, and it is hoped that these last will take the form of a guarantee of some sort. It is reliance upon Great Britain in the hour of need which is encouraging King Carol and his advisers to resist German pressure.

The advantages of supporting Rumania are obvious. Her wealth would prove an invaluable asset to Germany if it were to pass into the latter's hands, and would go far to render any blockade ineffective. If it be objected that this is to think in terms of war, it can only be answered that the example has been set by the rulers of modern Germany, and they can hardly complain if they find imitators. So long as the Balkan Entente holds together, and there is no reason why it should not, any ally of Rumania would be sure of access to the Black Sea, and would thus be able to land at Constanza. Supported in this way in the rear, and with a friendly Yugo-Slavia on her flank, Rumania would be a formidable opponent, for if the Bulgarians showed any disposition to strike her in the back the Turks and Greeks could be relied upon to hold them in check. Whether the situation will develop along these lines depends primarily upon Great Britain. It was impossible to come to the aid of the Czechs, but it is not even difficult to assist Rumania, and on every ground there is surely much to be said for such a policy.

In one respect the position of Rumania has improved

since the immediate post-war years, for she no longer goes in fear of Russia and her designs on Bessarabia. Rightly or wrongly the Rumanians believe that in consequence of Stalin's domestic policy Russia need not be taken seriously either as a friend or a foe, and they therefore leave her out of their calculations. However, in the event of serious trouble with Germany, they feel satisfied that their Russian frontier would be secure. That there can ever be real understanding between Soviet Russia and Rumania it is impossible to believe, and the failure of the former to return the Rumanian Crown Jewels, which were sent to Russia for safe custody during the Great War, is not forgotten ; but there is no reason to fear a revival of the old acute differences.

In a world really at peace Rumania might be envied on many counts, and she could certainly stand alone. She has great natural resources, an industrious and prolific population, and a King who is determined that she shall play her part in international affairs. Unhappily the times are not normal, and as she is subject to pressure from abroad so she must look for support beyond her own frontiers. True to her traditions she is looking for this to the Western Powers, and it is difficult to resist the conclusion that it is to their interest, as well as to hers, that this support should not be denied.

CHARLES PETRIE.

## Art. 10.—OCTAVIA HILL.

THE centenary of the birth of Octavia Hill in December 1838 has recently been celebrated. An exhibition of her work at the Housing Centre, a public dinner attended by the Minister of Health and many other distinguished guests, a pilgrimage to her grave at Crockham Hill, a party at the Red Cross Hall for her old tenants—these are some of the ways in which her friends and disciples have honoured her memory. In many others these celebrations have kindled an interest in the life and work of one who has not only been aptly described as the Florence Nightingale of the slums, but who must surely take her place as one of the great women of the Victorian Age.

From her earliest childhood Octavia Hill was brought up against the difficulties of life and was at grips with poverty. One of a large family of eleven children, with a father who became bankrupt a few years after her birth, she owed what education she possessed to a remarkable mother, who not only taught her five youngest daughters, but also looked after them and ran their country cottage single-handed. When Octavia was thirteen they moved to lodgings in London—the grimy, squalid London of Dickens—and soon she was working ten hours a day training for a livelihood and helping to straighten out the family affairs. She also managed a toy-making class at a 'ragged school,' and through this found her way to the homes of destitute children, who lived in indescribable poverty and filth. By the time she was seventeen her life had become a ceaseless round of work. In addition to the secretaryship of a Working Women's College, which carried the princely salary of 26*l.* a year, she devoted several hours a day to the study of art, while her evenings were given up to social work amongst the poor. A lesser nature would have been crushed by such a burden of work and responsibility at so tender an age, but Octavia's character and intellect flowered and ripened during these years of hardship, which were rich in new friendships destined to have an immeasurable influence on her future work.

Very soon after the Hill family had moved to London, and when Octavia was only fourteen, she began to meet

the leaders of the Christian Socialists. They were an inspiring band of enthusiasts, and the whole family soon fell under their spell. Of these the leading personality and the mainspring of their movement was Frederick Denison Maurice. He was a large-hearted, sincere, and lovable man, profoundly affected by the condition of the working classes, and his chief object in life was to help them and thereby to glorify God. Octavia first came to know him through his sermons at Lincoln's Inn Chapel, where for many years he was chaplain; they soon became intimate friends, and she helped many of the projects which he founded, including the Working Men's College and the Women's College. Other friends in the movement included Dr Furnivall, famous as a philologist and for his studies in Early English Texts, and Charles Kingsley, who at that time combined the position of a devoted parish priest with that of one of the most popular novelists of the day. In 'Yeast' and 'Alton Locke' he dealt with social problems in an original and brilliant way, and made known to the reading public some of the blackest spots in the industrial system. Because of his views, and also probably on account of his fine, rugged appearance, he became the hero and leader of what came to be known as 'Muscular Christianity.' Octavia fell under his spell from the first moment she saw him: 'I think I never saw such a face as Mr Kingsley's . . . extremely suffering and full of the deepest feeling. But there is such a sublime spirituality; he looks so far above this earth, as if he were rapt up in grand reveries; one feels such intense humility and awe of him.' She made a point of attending his sermons whenever he was preaching in London, and later came to know him personally and was able to help him in his efforts to reduce the infant mortality rate, through an Association of Ladies formed to promote sanitary reform.

To a girl of Octavia's temperament, deeply religious, imaginative, her heart already wrung by the sufferings of the poor, this movement and its champions came as a divine revelation, with the promise of a new heaven and a new earth. She unreservedly became a disciple, and its teachings influenced her to her life's end. On another side of Octavia's character, her artistic gifts and love of nature were greatly influenced by her friendship with John

Ruskin, which began when she was only a girl of fourteen. Octavia had already read his 'Modern Painters' and was a great admirer and champion of his teaching. Two years later she visited Ruskin's home in Denmark Hill, and showed him specimens of her work; and he promised to give her lessons in drawing and painting.

In these days it is difficult to realise the immense influence which Ruskin exercised over his generation or to appreciate the hero-worship which his personality and teaching evoked. Clothed in magnificent prose and inspired by an original and creative mind, his writings transformed the dry bones of the theory of art into a living force, which extended far beyond the confines of pure art to morals, religion, and social and political economy. His teaching was a crusade against low standards in every department of life, and against what he considered to be perverted ideals and vulgar complacencies. Its appeal to the young and the imaginative was electrical. Octavia responded instinctively to the magic of his personality. After her first visit to his house she writes: 'I have seen a world of beauty'; and later, 'not only is everything which he says precious—all opening new fields of thought and lighting them—but his home is full of the most wonderful pictures that I ever dreamed of.' The friendship then formed was a long and growing one, though not without its clouds in later years. But it was rich in inspiration and practical help, not only in matters of art but in other things dear to the heart of Octavia. And most important of all, it was Ruskin who made possible her first venture in house-property management.

At one time Octavia planned to train as a governess, but fortunately, in view of her later achievements, this never became necessary. All through her life, however, she was greatly interested in education. Her work for the toymakers and at the Women's College gave her practical experience at an early age, and so when her sisters started their school in Nottingham Place she threw herself with enthusiasm into their new venture and became their art teacher and valued adviser. The school was originally intended only for a few children of intimate friends, but its numbers rapidly grew until it occupied all the time and energies of Emily, Florence, and Miranda,

and all that Octavia could spare from her many other undertakings. Quite apart from her interest in the work, she rejoiced at the opportunity the school gave her of working with her sisters, to whom she was devoted. Among her many gifts was that of teaching people how to learn and how to love learning, and these, together with her power of leadership and stern discipline when required, combined to make her a valued member of the staff. Needless to say, it was not long before she began to start other activities at Nottingham Place; there was a weekly gathering in the kitchen of working women, who were taught to cut out and make clothes; and later on the stables were converted into a room for social gatherings of all kinds, including concerts for the blind.

But no human being, however strong, could indefinitely work at such pressure, and already at the age of twenty-two the strain began to tell upon Octavia; she owns to severe pains in walking distances, to fevers, and to feeling very, very weary. Even so she was loth to give up any of her work, and it required the combined persuasions, even the threats, of her family, Maurice, and Ruskin, to induce her to take a rest. But having once given way to necessity, she threw herself with her usual zest into her holiday. She rejoiced in the long weeks spent in the peace and beauty of the Lake District, where she was able to recapture her childhood's love of the country, that love which in later years found expression in her work for the preservation of the countryside and the founding of the National Trust. Equally precious to her were the visits to Italy, where on one occasion she spent over six months. The beauty of the country, the life of the people, the glory of the art collections all entranced her, and she entered into every aspect of the new life, even to joining the Cherubini Choral Society in Florence. New friendships were formed, among them the Robert Brownings, the Cockerells, and Mrs Janet Ross. Even so her thoughts constantly wing back to her beloved family and her work—'I hardly dare, even now, to write of home. I think of it as little as I can; the abiding sense of it in all its preciousness, and the heart-hunger for it never leaves me for a moment. . . . I have put aside the question of possible wants of one and another which I might satisfy, sure that I shall some day have a richer store of help to pour out for

them.' These holidays did providentially lead to gathering strength and renewed health, and enabled her on her return to London to undertake that great experiment in housing for which her name is famous.

In the middle of the nineteenth century the nation found itself faced by the problems arising from the rapid growth of the towns born of the industrial revolution. The greatest building activity took place from 1801 to 1848, before any housing legislation existed, with deplorable results. Every factory became the centre of new housing—and such housing! The lack of efficient means of transport and the absence of building laws to regulate the construction of new streets and houses resulted in the uncontrolled crowding of the largest possible number of persons into the smallest possible area. Consequently London grew in haphazard fashion without consideration for town planning or the needs of the workers of that day, let alone the needs of the future. Street after street sprang up, each more ugly, narrow, and insanitary than the last. Houses were built back to back, without yards, in narrow alleys or in courts closed at both ends. Often there was no drainage system or any other means of disposing of refuse than by throwing it in the street; and water was only obtainable from carts or else had to be drawn from contaminated supplies. Under these conditions people lived closely packed together, sometimes sleeping ten or twelve in a room. In the common lodging-houses as many as forty would sleep in one cellar-bedroom, which often lacked a window or other means of ventilation. Some idea of the conditions at this time may be gathered from a report given to the Royal Commission of 1838 by Dr Southwood Smith, Octavia's grandfather :

'Quarters inhabited by hundreds of thousands of the labouring classes . . . crowding more or less dense in courts and alleys and narrow streets almost insusceptible of ventilation, in dwellings which themselves were often not fit to be inhabited by human beings; while all around the dwellings the utter absence of drainage, the utter omission of scavenging and nuisance prevention, the utter insufficiency of water supply, conduced to such accumulations of animal and vegetable refuse, and to such pondings of ordurous liquids, as made one universal atmosphere of filth and stink.'

Such were the conditions of the housing of the London poor when Octavia began her work in 1864. It is true that, thanks to Dr Southwood Smith's efforts, the first Public Health Act had been passed in 1848, followed in 1851 by Lord Shaftesbury's Acts—which secured the inspection and provision of lodging-houses; but these reforms had then hardly begun to function, and in any case they touched only the fringe of the problems.

An incident connected with the dressmaking classes held at Nottingham Place confirmed Octavia's growing conviction that housing reform was the crying need of the day. At the classes she got to know a poor working woman who was terribly handicapped by living in a damp, unhealthy kitchen, and she determined to help her to move to better quarters; but in spite of exhaustive inquiries she could not find any rooms at a suitable rent or whose landlords would accept children. Octavia was indignant beyond words. It was in this frame of mind that she went to visit Ruskin, soon after the death of his father, and learned that he had inherited a big fortune. He confessed to her that he was puzzled as to how to make the best use of it. In a flash there came to her the thought that here perhaps was the solution of her problem. She explained to him the needs of the poor and their exploitation at the hands of rapacious landlords, who charged exorbitant rents and failed to carry out the most urgent repairs. She pointed out the terrible need of decent accommodation for the working classes at a rent which they could afford, and what an opportunity this was for anyone who wished to serve his fellow-men; and finally she suggested that he should dedicate some of his fortune to this work and become a model landlord. Ruskin needed little persuasion. He was already deeply interested in the welfare of the poor and he had implicit faith in Octavia's judgment. He did not feel, however, that he had the time or capacity to undertake the work himself, but he offered to provide the capital if she would undertake the management. Octavia, of course, jumped at the idea, and so her great work of housing began.

Then followed months of happy activity. Details of model lodging-houses were studied, houses suitable and unsuitable were inspected, and the financial details were worked out. Within a year, in spite of legal and other

delays, the scheme was set going by the purchase of three small tenement houses in Paradise Place, Marylebone. They were in a terrible state of neglect and dirt, and each room (there were six rooms in each house) was occupied by a family living in extreme poverty and degradation—a situation which would have daunted most people. But Octavia was in her element, planning and calculating, interviewing builders and plumbers, thrilled with every detail of the work—‘I am so happy I can hardly walk on the ground’ she confided to a friend. By degrees these dwellings were converted into clean, sanitary homes, and an attempt was made to remedy the worst overcrowding. The rents were collected every week by Octavia and her friends, and the balance, after the payment of rates and repairs, was paid into Ruskin’s bank every quarter. It was explained to the tenants that a regular percentage of their rents was set apart for repairs and renewals, and that the less damage they did the more money would be available for improving their homes and for additional equipment, such as meat-safes and copper-lids. The tenants responded in a wonderful way and the breakages were practically reduced to nil. At the very beginning Ruskin wisely suggested that 5 per cent. should be paid on the capital invested, not that he cared for money himself, but because he was anxious to prove to others that here was a good and useful investment for money. Octavia agreed with that object, but added doubtingly: ‘Who will ever hear of what I do?’—perhaps one of the few occasions when her judgment was in error.

The bare provision and management of the house properties was only part of her dream of helping the London workers. ‘I see such bright things that may (that almost must) grow out of it,’ she declared at the very beginning of her work. And certainly hardly had she got possession of the first block of tenements when plans were afoot for a tenants’ club, to meet in a hall converted from the stables of her own home in Nottingham Place. A little later she was able, through Ruskin, to buy another property, and there it was possible to make a playground for the children and to start some tiny gardens. When the work was further developed she devoted an afternoon every week to taking the tenants for expeditions to the country; on one occasion a party of five hundred went to Southend.

Already crystal clear in her mind were the principles on which her housing work was based, and has been continued ever since. These principles ran counter to many of the conventions of the day. For in the mid-Victorian era the majority of people held what may be called the 'red flannel petticoat' theory of philanthropy. The poor, they argued, were a permanent division of humanity, the workers who were necessary to preserve the standards of civilisation of the upper classes. It is true that the rich were expected to grant of their superfluity to their poorer neighbours, but it was always temporary relief—joints of meat at Christmas and mittens and flannel petticoats for the winter cold. In times of exceptional distress they supported nobly such special efforts as the Mansion House funds of the 'sixties. But any idea of permanently improving the condition of the working classes was not considered practical charity—or perhaps politics. To Octavia Hill these ideas were wrong. Her aim was to help people to help themselves and not to shower indiscriminate charity on them. She felt that the majority of working-class families were living under conditions which made it almost impossible for them to live decent, self-respecting lives. The damp, ill-ventilated tenements and basements, the lack of conveniences, the depressing gloom of cracked walls and ceilings and lack of paint, all these combined to sap the vitality of the people who were condemned to live in them, and to undermine their natural desire to maintain a decent home. Generally extortionate rent was paid for these miserable dwellings; often the whole of it remained in the pockets of the landlords, while the most necessary repairs went by the board. Thus the slum and the slum-dweller were created; for those who could afford no better quarters soon yielded to the conditions imposed upon them, and sank to a level of squalor in keeping with their surroundings. Octavia held that with a landlord eager to promote the welfare of his tenants and with tenants appreciative of the better standard of life provided, such conditions would cease to exist. And that, since she had proved that 5 per cent. could be paid on capital, housing would be regarded as a sound business proposition, and no longer as a charity. Indeed, she held strong views as to the deleterious effects of charity on those who receive it:

'A gigantic machinery of complicated charities relieves a man of half his responsibilities . . . there is no certainty, no quiet, no order in his way of subsisting. And he has an innate sense that his most natural wants ought to be supplied if he works ; so he takes our gifts thanklessly ; and then we blame him or despise him for his alternative servility and ingratitude.'

She felt that the only way to give material help was through personal contact, and by teaching that those who receive must also learn to give : ' When our gifts are given and received by the same person, they are ennobling. . . . Call a man out of himself by letting him know the joy of receiving and giving, and you may pour your gifts upon him, even lavishly, and not corrupt him.' This conviction is connected with the other great principle of her housing work : her insistence on the need of personal contact between the landlord or manager and the tenant ; a personal touch which should combine humane and sympathetic dealing with wise discipline, and such understanding of each family as to know how best to move and teach them.

Based on such sure foundations, the housing work was successful from the very beginning ; and more than vindicated Octavia's foresight and optimism. As dingy court and dilapidated cottage passed under her management, so builders and plumbers were set to work, transforming them into bright and healthy homes. Then one of her workers would be appointed to take charge of the new development, and personal contact would be established with all the tenants. It could not fail to rejoice the hearts of all doing this work to note how quickly the families responded to the new conditions—the rooms were kept clean and tidy and the owners began to take a real pride in their homes. The progress of the work was powerfully helped by a band of devoted workers. At first Octavia relied only on a few personal friends and on pupils from the school at Nottingham Place. But, as her work became more widely known, she received offers of help from every sort and condition of person, all anxious to be trained by her in this new sphere of social service. In these days, when nearly every profession is open to women, there seems nothing incongruous in a woman house-property manager. But at that time for a woman to be skilful in business was considered almost unladylike,

and it speaks volumes for Octavia's force of character that she was able to break down this prejudice.

The rapid growth of the work was astounding. Ruskin was, of course, the pioneer model landlord, but soon offers of other property came from many quarters. In some instances people asked Octavia to find suitable property in order that they might buy it and place it under her management—notably Lord Pembroke, who intrusted 6000*l.* to her for this purpose. By 1877, that is to say only thirteen years after her first experiment, she had 3500 tenants under her charge and was responsible for a yearly rent-roll of about 40,000*l.* Perhaps the greatest compliment was paid to her when she was asked to undertake the management of property belonging to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, themselves among the biggest landowners in London. They constantly increased the property under her care, and in 1903 they asked her to take over an additional estate with nearly 600 tenancies, with a rent roll of over 250*l.* a week. Further recognition of her work came from many quarters, for her articles in 'Macmillan's' and the 'Nineteenth Century' made her known to a very wide public. Her book, 'Homes of the London Poor' was translated into German by Princess Alice, and led to the formation of an 'Octavia Hill Verein' in Berlin, while workers from Sweden, Holland, Russia, and the U.S.A. came to ask her advice and learn her methods. As an authority on housing, she sat on numerous influential committees, and her advice was much sought by members of both Houses when the Artisan's Dwellings Bills were before Parliament.

By the latter half of the nineteenth century there came to be a growing sense of public responsibility for the proper housing of the people, which resulted in the great Housing Act of 1890 and in the starting of many of the pioneer Housing Trusts, such as the Peabody and Lewis foundations. Octavia Hill's life and work contributed largely to the change in public opinion which brought about these reforms and experiments, but her greatest contribution to housing was her insistence on the importance of good management and the methods which she initiated to that end. She realised that it is not enough merely to provide houses and estates and to put people into them. For the houses, if they are to serve their

purpose, must be properly maintained, while the tenants themselves, with all the social problems which they present, are the dominant factor in determining the success or failure of any housing project. And so for this purpose she founded a system of trained women house-property managers. She chose women rather than men because they are specially suited for the work, and since it is nearly always the wives from whom rents are actually collected it is easier for a woman to gain admittance to the flats for the weekly rent-collecting. Thereby the woman rent-collector has two golden opportunities—in the first place she can note any immediate repairs that are needed, a small leak in the roof, a smoking chimney or a broken stair; and, what is more important still, she can establish a sympathetic relationship with the family. In most cases the time comes when she is regarded as a real friend, and as such there are endless possibilities of helping in difficulty or distress.

This system of management has stood the test of time and has proved adjustable to the widely differing conditions of to-day. The large number of fully trained women who are carrying on the great tradition, are engaged in managing house-property of the most varied types. Two great public bodies, the Commissioners of Crown Lands and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, have placed over 4000 of their tenancies under Octavia Hill management, while no less than 35 local authorities have appointed women house-property managers, who are responsible for about 50,000 tenancies. The first large housing association to be formed was the Improved Tenements Association, founded in 1900 for the reconditioning of houses in Kensington under Octavia Hill's own management; since then a large number of other such associations have been started to build or to recondition property, and of these some forty employ her system. Practical training for this work is now undertaken by the Society of Women Housing Managers, and consists of a mixture of technical, legal, and social subjects, including building construction, sanitation, the measurement and valuation of dilapidations, the law of landlord and tenant, estate accounts, and kindred matters.

The spirit that was in Octavia Hill was never more alive than to-day, and she is still the inspiration of those

who are working for better housing. A recent Minister of Health is reported to have said in Parliament a few years ago that he was tired of 'the sainted name of Octavia Hill.' A notable answer to the girl, who some seventy years before had wondered, 'Who will ever hear of what I do?'

Octavia Hill's name is so intimately connected with housing that the many other activities of her life are apt to be overlooked. Housing was only one of the many pioneer movements with which she was actively associated, for she championed the provision of gardens for the poor, of playgrounds for children, of welfare centres in nursery schools, and Open Spaces, and she was concerned with the foundation of movements for Garden Cities, University Settlements, Cadet Corps, and Smoke Abatement. One is left amazed at the number of her interests, and at the amount of thought and personal work she was able to devote to each one of them. The truth is that she had a passionate longing to make the world a better and a happier place, and all these schemes were in the pattern of her heart's desire. As a girl of nineteen she had confided to a friend—'To me the whole world is so full of things crying out to be done, each one of which would be sufficient for a lifetime's heart and thought.' For an average person each one of these activities would have been enough for a life's work : but she was not an average person, and she took them all in her stride.

Her knowledge of the conditions of the poor and her wisdom and experience made her in great demand on committees. But there she was not really in her element, and she once frankly confessed that she preferred 'power and responsibility and work, to committees and their slow, dull movements.' She did, however, join the Central Council of the Charity Organisation Society, and took a large share in shaping its policy in the stormy days of its birth. The duller moments of these meetings were not wasted, for then rent books, pen, and ink bottle (carried slung on a string round her neck) were produced, and the time was profitably employed in adding up columns of figures. And many years later, somewhat against her will, she agreed to serve on the Royal Commission on the Poor Law. Having made up her mind to

do it, she threw herself with her usual zest into the very exhausting work of visits to Institutions as far afield as Yorkshire, South Wales, and Scotland—and this when she was in her seventieth year and suffering from the effects of a bad carriage accident.

Her work for the Open Space movement needs a very special mention. People to-day are apt to take their playground for granted—Lincoln's Inn Fields, for example—and imagine they have always been open to the public. But sixty years ago, when Octavia Hill started her campaign, the very idea that such things were essential was new. She had the vision to foresee the ravages of the speculative builder and to grasp the pressing need for action if any of the green spaces of the Metropolis were to be saved from the desolation of bricks and mortar. At first she found it difficult to rouse public opinion, and apart from the usual English lethargy about things that really matter, she had to face active opposition. The comic and society papers, kindred spirits then as now, were definitely scornful; even 'Punch'—the sponsor of many good causes—was so hostile that one reader was moved to subscribe generously to the campaign because of the virulent attacks in its pages. The first attempt to save an open space was a failure. News came to Octavia that the fields near the Swiss Cottage were to be built over. This was a great blow, as they were the nearest country outlet for her friends, the poor of St Marylebone. She at once began to raise funds to buy the land, and in a short time collected over 9000*l.*, an amazing sum to have secured for a new and unknown cause. Most unfortunately agents and builders and other interested parties got wind of the fact that the purchase-money was likely to be forthcoming, and they were able to put such difficulties in the way that the scheme had to be abandoned. But though Fitzjohn's Avenue rose upon the green fields and upon the ruin of Octavia's hopes for that area, in the end her movement triumphed. Influential friends came forward to sponsor it, and it became one of the activities of the Kyrle Society, founded by her sister Miranda, with the result that Parliament Fields and the adjoining land were added to Hampstead Heath, and many other 'lungs' were preserved for Londoners—to be, in Octavia's words, 'places near a city, where fresh winds may blow, and

where wild flowers still are found, and where happy people can still walk within reach of their homes.' Her desire to bring beauty everywhere led her to form another section of the Kyrle Society, whose aim it was to lay out existing open spaces—such as embankments and disused burial grounds—and to transform them into gardens. In one of her letters she alludes to the 'heart-hunger in the spirits of people for more beauty and more quiet,' a need which she sought to satisfy by changing those ugly and barren wastes into havens of rest and of delight to the eye.

The danger to open spaces was not confined to London and the big cities. In the country estates were being broken up and places of beauty and historic interest treasured by generations of English people were threatened with the blight of the industrialist and the speculative builder. Octavia was one of the first to realise that active steps must be taken if these places were to be preserved for the nation; and so together with Sir Robert Hunter and Canon Rawnsley she founded the National Trust in 1895. Its beginnings were very humble, for it depended for its existence on the subscriptions of a small band of enthusiasts, most of them personal friends of the three founders. Its first possession was the Dinas Cliff at Barmouth, about which Octavia is reported to have said: 'We have got our first piece of property; I wonder if it will be our last!' Once set in motion the Trust progressed steadily, and by the time of her death in 1912 it had acquired estates as far from London as the Lake District and the coast of Cornwall. It could count amongst its possessions Barras Head at Tintagel, Blakeney Point in Norfolk, the Devil's Punchbowl at Hindhead, Cheddar Cliffs, Ide Hill in Kent, Minchinhampton Common in Gloucestershire, and much else, including such places of historic interest as Barrington Court in Somerset, Long Crendon Court-house, and the Priest's House at Alfriston. That may well have seemed at the time a surprising advance on modest beginnings; but the possessions of the National Trust in 1912 were as nothing compared with what they are to-day. The latest returns show that they own over 80,000 acres and protect some 300 buildings, and each year they continue to save for the many what the few would carelessly destroy. To all these activities Octavia brought not only her enthusiasm

and driving force, but also what has been described as her 'deep statesmanship.' Broadminded in outlook, wise and cool-headed in judgment, she was generous enough to give all her helpers leave to work in their own way and opportunities of carrying out their own ideas. Authority came naturally to her and she was a strict disciplinarian, not that she liked rules and regulations or lacked sympathy, but because she knew how infinitely more difficult it is to be just than to be kind.

So much attention has rightly been focused on Octavia Hill's achievements that even her most devoted disciples have sometimes failed to recognise the greatness of her character. The picture of the shrewd and successful woman of business has overshadowed that of the visionary who devoted all her gifts to help her fellow men and women. The magnificent organiser has eclipsed the most personal of human beings—the woman who lived all her life in close intimate touch with all sorts and conditions of people, and who held that human sympathy and the power of human love were more important than laws and societies. Yet all that she did was no more remarkable than all that she was—the devout Christian, the cultured woman of the world and the sensitive artist, the devoted daughter and sister, and the gay and delightful friend and companion. Mention has been made of her early contact with the Christian Socialists, whose teachings remained an abiding influence in her life. As a young girl she was a diligent church-goer and entered with fervour into the doctrinal controversies of the day. As she grew older, the institutional side of religion counted less with her, but one cannot read her letters without becoming aware that she was vividly conscious of the spiritual world and that she lived all her life close to God. No one can have cared less than she did for worldly success or for public recognition of her work. Her feelings on these matters are summarised in a sentence of a letter to Sir Sydney Cockerell: 'I have never thought the world's regard, or money-success, or worldly surroundings worth anything; and, when they fall away from us, I think it is often that they may leave us free to enter into realities.' When she was offered a seat in the Abbey for the Queen's Jubilee of 1887 she confided to her mother: 'I cannot think why I, who have done so simply, at no

great cost, just what lay before me, should be singled out in this kind of way.' Some years later a group of friends presented her with her portrait painted by Sargent, and she was deeply touched by this proof of appreciation of her work.

For wealth she cared as little as for worldly success. While she was still a comparatively young woman, a group of generous friends made it possible for her to give up salaried posts, so as to be free to devote herself to housing and other work amongst the poor. Though profoundly thankful to be thus spared financial anxiety, she never envied those who possessed great wealth, nor did she crave for anything beyond the means of her modest income. 'Personal poverty is a help to me,' she wrote to a friend. 'It keeps me more simple and energetic, and somehow low and humble and hardy in the midst of a somewhat intoxicating power.'

Although Octavia's formal schooling ceased at an age which in these days is considered to be the starting-point of secondary education, yet her love of learning continued all through her life. Geology, botany, and Italian are some of the subjects she taught herself when she was already launched in a busy life. Later she learnt Latin (whilst brushing her long hair in the mornings) in order to be able to teach one of George Macdonald's children. She never allowed her mass of administrative work to dull or cramp the vigour of her intellect. However busy she might be, however many plans might be hatching in her fertile brain, yet she always found time for daily reading, for visits to lectures and picture galleries and concerts, and for many other sources of inspiration and refreshment for mind and spirit. Perhaps she was fortunate in that repeated breakdowns in health compelled her to spend long months abroad, on one occasion nearly two years. With sympathetic companions she visited not only France, Italy, Switzerland, Germany, and Austria, but countries more remote and in those days considered hardly suitable for lady travellers—the Adriatic, Greece, Turkey, and Roumania. Wherever she went she rejoiced in the natural beauties of the countries and in their works of art; everywhere she entered into the life of the country, the customs of the peasants, the problems of their governments. She made numerous water-colour sketches, and

her letters home reveal an acute and receptive mind, enjoying to the uttermost historical associations and keenly appreciating modern political problems—whether concerned with the unification of Italy, with brigandage in Greece, or with the aftermath of the Crimea.

It is also remarkable that in a life so filled with action Octavia should have found time to cultivate so many true and deep friendships. It would be easy to make a list of the notable people of her day who felt themselves honoured by knowing her; it would be more difficult to name her intimate companions, from Mary Harris, the confidante of her girlhood, to Miss Harriot Yorke, who lived with her for so many years and helped her in all her projects; it would be impossible to number her devoted friends, known and unknown, among the alleys and tenements of the London courts. In friendship, as in other things, she was sensitive to true values. After a dinner-party at which she had met a number of celebrities she confided to Mary Harris: 'It is all very interesting, but how often the loveliest and best things one meets are not among the celebrities at all, but are found by piercing below the surface of those who are supposed to be commonplace.' She was devoted to her mother and sisters and was never so happy as when in the bosom of her family. As mother and daughters were all women of great character and varied interests, one might have expected clashes and jealousies. But they all lived in the greatest amity, rejoicing in each other's company. From the family letters we often catch a glimpse of Octavia's charm as a companion—her high spirits, her peals of laughter, her happy disposition, and her power of enjoying the greatest discomforts—as when she wrote to her sister Florence: 'We drove to the foot of Ullswater, and then rowed up it—nine miles; but it poured, which we thought fun.' Her portrait by Sargent reveals some of the other characteristics which endeared her to her friends—vivacity, enthusiasm, and a certain self-confidence which made her master of any situation in which she happened to find herself.

To call Octavia Hill a typical Victorian would be an exaggeration and would be unmindful of her genius; and yet she was typical of the Victorian woman at her best. She suffered many of the disadvantages of the majority

of the women of her day—a scanty education, a lack of means, and a public opinion which confined feminine activities to the care of the household and for a feminine career recognised only that of the governess. Though her family and friends were enlightened people, yet even so the old prejudices died hard. One of her greatest friends was offered the post of honorary secretary to a children's hospital, but had to refuse it as her parents considered that no daughter ought to leave home except to be married or to earn her own living, and cited as a shocking example Florence Nightingale who was reported to have returned a mere wreck! And another illuminating picture of the times is preserved in Octavia's description of the way in which Robert Browning was persuaded to sign a petition to Parliament in favour of what ultimately took form in the Married Women's Property Act; he did so with some diffidence, despite his liberal views, and was apprehensive lest the proposed alteration in the law should entail other greater injustices—to whom is not stated; even Browning's creative genius appears to have failed to produce a victim. Yet in spite of these disadvantages, and without political power or social prestige, Octavia Hill achieved her ends by her extraordinary industry, common sense, and power of imagination. These are qualities found in many women. In the intensity with which they are held and used by individuals lies often the difference between the commonplace and the great.

JACQUELINE COCKBURN.

## Art. 11.—THE ROOTS OF A NATION.

SPECULATION and suspense are the attitudes to-day of most European peoples and of many others. There is a very imperfectly understood and little faced clash of moralities—for tragedy can be defined as the collision not of wrong with right, but of two rights: two conceptions each of which has something to be said for it. These differing Rights will be fairly confronted in the pages that follow.

Broadly, they are the dynamic and the static. One set of forces ask for scope, on biological and (they would add) on genuinely moral grounds. Another group reply that the methods of raising the demands are irregular and embarrassing, are even in places excessive, and take inadequate cognisance of existing interests and susceptibilities. Both are differently right. They must in the nature of things agree—after war or without war.

Something enormously greater than 'face' has to be saved: hampered populations, the happiness and future of white populations, the rights of others not white, vulnerable minorities, a possible future Christendom. The task is beyond tactics. Morals, biology, and philosophy have much to say. As this is a world which does not carry its meaning on its face, and as humanity is not its own explanation, so 'political' problems will find their enduring solution in no purely political expedients (still less in merely economic), because man is more than a political animal.

Opinion in Britain has been moving to better purpose recently than at any time since the War. At last it is being turned to the *foundations* of our existence, far beneath party games or ideological faction—to the birth-rate, population pressure, balance between urban and rural life, human distribution, national service, manpower, organisation, stronger agriculture, and serious colonisation. Some of these deeper biological points, discussed in these pages, were stressed at one of the most intelligent meetings reported for years, that of the young Universities Conservatives, which showed that politics is taking on a new reality or resuming the reality it should never have lost. One frank speech after another drove right down to the living roots which determine survival.

They see—who does not?—the worth of the British heritage ; but, they asked, if we believe in it, why not produce enough heirs and successors to it ? We have been wonderfully furnishing the old house with amenities for generations ; and now we discover that all this may be very well, but the very corner-stones need attention. Otherwise, we may even have to ‘ prove title.’

There are still to-day quantities of mental ability dispersed over comparatively surface and secondary matters, which is pure loss so long as the long-date but decisive issues are forgotten. There is still too much heat generated over social services and the privileges we take as our personal gift ; but the severe school of history teaches us these are luxuries, and precarious ones, if not based on national power, independence, and increase. ‘ A few strong instincts and a few plain rules,’ as our great philosophic poet said, are really what is needed ; a return to the sources of strength, to nature, to tradition, to robust standards only recently forgotten. To-day there are a large number of side-doors of escape from the vital, homely, and quite understandable tasks that invite us. Some of our art is but exquisite fooling ; enormous technical skill is at the service of distraction. Many men of letters and philosophers for the people make shirking, under some other name, respectable : yet if the individuals who make up a people seek a soft time, it invariably means the nation will reach a hard time. Glance at some of the substitutes for reality.

Hardly a country in the world to-day can claim that all its leaders or representative men appreciate what that human material essentially is, in which they deal. There is in our time a division of labour in leadership, with the drawbacks attendant upon such division, whatever its inevitability : one type of mind directing party, another running the civil service, a third governing business ; and these may have little that is vital in common with the chief intelligences in arts or science ; and the effective contacts of any of them with the philosophic or spiritual mind are largely fortuitous. More or less openly we all miss the integration and compactness which a simpler and earlier society, we believe, possessed ; and while some give it up as lost and others ‘ cast a longing, lingering look behind ’ at a social and even an international unity

conferred by a shared belief and culture, these are not the only possible reactions. There is, as may appear, a more hopeful road.

Several ways exist of meeting the fact of the insecurity, the danger of the world. There have been the Oriental ways of sublimated evasion, in which there occurred prodigies of mental abstraction from terrestrial risks and contradictions. There was Stoicism, set up violently to meet a desperate world situation. For a time and for a class it was a ring wall built over against chaos. It sheltered in its time not a few critical minds—there are several to-day, such as Bertrand Russell, who take cold cover in it. For Stoicism things do not happen, or if they happen they do not gravely matter. In nothing be anxious; there is nothing worth it. 'Man is as a shadow and disquieteth himself in vain.' There was the vanity of vanities, of Ecclesiastes; the Horatian *poco curante*; the Virgilian majesty of sadness; the indignation of Juvenal and Persius; the trifling of Ovid; the easily popularised, unstrung 'philosophy' of Omar Khayam—of whom all have their modern representatives in literature, easily named. You can take a wide choice of defence apparatus against environing necessity and peril, a variety of man-made shelters and half-way-houses in the general inclemency. Or there is the revived notion of incessantly repeated cycles, Time everlastingly plagiarising itself; a theory which seduced Nietzsche but which in him provoked an antithesis—the equally visionary picture of a ceaseless 'becoming'; though a becoming of *what*, he couldn't convincingly say. His super-man was only unsatisfactory man writ large, with the heart left out, the heart that weeps and trembles and sympathises. 'We shall suffer shipwreck on the infinite,' he wrote. 'Or else, my brothers, or else?' The gods confounded him: he suffered shipwreck on the infinite. He broke his human brain. For ten years after he lived the life of a little child; then he died. Dionysius will not help, then; will Apollo? The doctrine of breed and race may be tried on a national scale, but the final pessimism that dogs all paganism as a shadow will be its Nemesis. 'Sacred *egoismo*' proves, after all, to be not so sacred. It does not even work. But it is not quite so squat and truncated an idol as economics, as Marxism, that comically

defective materialism which temporarily grips the submerged and dispossessed, who knife or bomb their way to the front. It has as much delusion, but more poetry—or at least more colour and rhetoric. Being a lie, however, or, what is much worse, a half-truth, it falls, and great is the fall of it. If man cannot live by bread alone, neither can he live by Narcissism though it be inculcated as nationalism. The spirit cannot live on self, nor on the enlarged self of the tribe.

Certain domestic and international discomforts and evils have admittedly a material source, or partly material; for instance, there is an exportable surplus of goods in nearly every country which no one else can buy, and consequently there is a deal of grotesquely unnecessary poverty. But when plain common sense has thawed this frozen commerce, and even when the released goods have reached the people who most need them, that will not be human nature's fruition. The smooth and rapid functioning of externals will not fundamentally help us, unless we have mental peace and freedom based on true conceptions of man and his ends. Money and invention can give us cables, telegraphy, radio, papers, and films, but it is something utterly different which alone can give us anything worth putting over through these media. Cash and organisation can bestow on some of us leisure, but are as dumb as a gatepost on the only crucial question of what shall fill and dignify leisure. The moment that we even half believe that man's life somehow does consist in the abundance of the things which he possesseth, progress is stopped in a tedious, a philistine cul-de-sac, and invariably its accompaniment is fatty degeneration of the soul and a well-groomed, neatly tailored vulgarity.

A simple instance, which shall stand for many. A 'progressive' politician, who certainly knew that he was heir to the wisdoms of the ages, asked in a rural district what he would advocate to rescue the culture, health, and contentment of our countryside and its farming, brightly improvised the suggestion—in the very idiom of our time—'Electrify the labourer's cottage.' This is the caricature of materialism, and surely will 'date' more fatally than the burlesqued furniture of the Victorians. Even as materialism it was not good of its kind; it had nothing to say of far more wanted and important things,

such as a good water supply or of better-kept lanes and roads to make farms and cities mutually accessible. The rustic audience, seasoned to realities, could hardly bring themselves to a pitying smile. They were, in fact, thinking rather of a balanced policy and the husbandman's status in it. Smattering too often supplants thought in matters that call for a deep philosophy hardly applied by consistent men over a period. This falling back upon *ad hoc* tinkering, as one symptom after another becomes a nuisance to a party or administration, is like expecting 'make-up' to take the place of health and vitality.

The truth is, every man of action's first need, his one insurance against tangling affairs still further, is a true philosophy, an idea of the worth-while ends of man. Without this, better that he were a man of inaction. Those most prone to be 'up and doing' should be seated and thinking; and 'Do it now' might often with advantage be revised to 'Leave it undone.' If busyness could have saved man, he would have found salvation long ago. If neat partial schemes and surface machinery were competent to bring the race safety, we would now be in our second or third century of invulnerability. Science by all means; but let it know the human being for whom it is catering. And the craving to formulate is not always the child of science—rather does it belong to the order of utility and hurry and convenience, not to that of knowledge. Lucidity is easier of attainment than truth—and dead easy when deeper aspects of truth are ignored. Marx, the unoriginal, had only to exaggerate—very slightly—Adam Smith, Bentham, Ricardo, and part of Darwin, and, regarding man as producer-consumer and herd, shout down the chorus of other and profounder facts: and that was *his* contribution to the solution of the riddle of existence. D. H. Lawrence sinks back for clue into the 'dark of the instincts and blood,' unaware even that he was but one more of the moderns who have shrunk from the calls of reason and logic. A surrender to the drive of unconscious desire is a negation of form and significance, and is mere disorder and anarchy. Von Hartmann with his 'Philosophy of the Unconscious,' the Behaviorists, the invokers of mumbo-jumbo from the subconscious, certain psycho-charlatans, Nietzsche's 'I will will Illusion,' Schopenhaver's 'World as Will and

Idea,' even aspects of Alexander's 'Time and Deity,' and of course masses of German subjectivism culminating in the Nazi prophet Rosenberg's deliberate 'Myth of the Twentieth Century'—all these have in common escapism and defiance. The last-named fantasy, momentarily important because it is buttressed by party and territorial expansionist policy, actually boasts that it is not meant to be 'objective' truth for other breeds, but is 'truth for us,' i.e. German-truth: a new bird in the religious and philosophical aviary.

We need not fear that such personal projections can long subjugate a nation which, after all, has produced inquirers and honest observers of facts and law. Such theories pour the baby out with the bath-water; and the rich crowded worlds of Reality will not be 'tidied up' in the interests of a mood or a minority. The vice of these sweeping formulas and private-company religions—that which makes them tiresome and incredible—is their attempt to be rid of events and variety, and to impose upon us a predigested world. Even Lucretius elicits his iron music by avoiding most of the stops in the organ and most of the music in the ordinary candid man's repertoire. The optimist Leibnitz, the mathematical Descartes, the wilful emotional Luther, the rigorist Calvin, the absolutist Hegel are shadowed by this human but sterilising passion for selection and clipping of data. Some of these systems are more, some less remarkable fabrications of art and dialectic; tributes to an individual's mental powers and peculiarities, hardly reflections or interpretations of the manifold universe. They will continue to be produced because the human mind cannot be passive under the flow and blows of events; it is an original agent, with its perennial impulse to reply and create.

In world affairs men are especially prone to these premature simplifications. Nay, worse: the men thus guilty are less trained and qualified, they are too often more narrowly passionate, their subject-matter is around them active and hostile and touchy. Small wonder there is almost chronic strain, tempered by periodical crisis. The marvel surely is that there is respite from war. Here an admission that other cases and other aspects than one's own exist, not merely spoils a period or makes a breach in a rounded philosophy; it may lose readers or an

election. Political generalisations are the chosen home of fallacies. We hypostatise multitudes of divergent individuals as a unit, a personality, and clamp on to them the character of their present public representative. And much of this polemic is surprisingly untypical of the national groups whom it is supposed to express. Totalitarian rulers can be no surer of their backing and their background, ultimately, than a leader of one side in a democracy. They merely know less the extent of the feeling which does not support them. The steps they take against it are different, that is all. In both kinds of regime, there are masses of inchoate and incalculable feeling. Many current 'demands' (for 'equality' on one hand, for 'collective security' on the other) do not quite understand themselves; a good deal of existing tension, with its clichés and war-cries, is what physiologists and physicians know as 'referred pain'; its actual seat is surprisingly somewhere else in the body public. It is sometimes a demand for the shadow when the substance is possessed. How can you give equality to a State which already enjoys not equality only, but the something more which keeps others alert? How shall a Power acquire friendship and trust?—not by *doing* anything forceful, but precisely by not doing it, by being mild and its natural self; by relaxing in short, and having the common human touch. But pacificism too does not know its own face in the glass. 'Collective security,' as they urge it, is either a clumsy mask for a military alliance—balance-of-power-politics—or it is wish-fulfilment giving allies our work to do; or it is a bromide phrase, not faced or analysed. 'Law' is likewise a 'boss-word' to brandish, but it looks a less eligible weapon when translated 'legalism,' frequently its truer name. The law in question had a maker; the interesting point often is, Who? Another may arise, namely: Why? For just behind the arrangements labelled 'law' there is curious, mixed historical fact, highly questionable and much questioned (sometimes by the makers of the laws or treaties). Beyond the equivocal historical facts, however, blurred as these may be by partisan claims or national mistakes, there are broad human rights and fundamental decencies more important than any racial, prescriptive argument. So that even territorial desires based on past occupation *can*

veil a certain amount of egoism and prejudice, and *do* so if the weal of the present occupants is not put first. It is only another kind of legalism otherwise. Once begin a scramble for land on the pretext of previous possession and half the human race would start an itinerant existence. We could notify Washington that we do not recognise anything following the Boston tea dispute—and Holland could enter a demur that New York was New Amsterdam before the English arrived. That would be devastating, until a pow-wow of Big Chiefs of the reservations silenced the white man with an unanswerable historical fact or two. The Welsh could remind us of the invasion of the long-boats. There is, indeed, hardly a settlement in Europe which special pleading of the kith and kin, blood and soil order could not unsettle.

Humanity will have to get beneath even the historical sophism, and nation ask nation for some population- or trade-adjustment on the more respectable grounds of equity, mutual friendship, good will, and the human right to bread and work. Thus we are back to Morals, because there is no other firm standing ground for man. All these picturesque latter-day theorems, which are so easily and plausibly rigged to pave the path for coveters of a Naboth's vineyard, must be quietly dropped—and the present tenants of them, no less, see their own rôle as that of stewards and caretakers agreeable to the reasonably open door. The world will see 'collective security' when it has recognised collective opportunity and collective responsibility. A sovereign boon meanwhile would be less excessive emphasis upon national sovereignty and a good deal more upon that essential likeness of personal and community life everywhere of which radio exchange-programmes are giving people increasing glimpses. The oneness of humanity continually needs stressing; but it cannot be successfully preached by communism nor secular socialisms—they usually make it suspect—since it has only one grand sanction and support, other than that of the good heart and common sense enlightened by travel, and that is the Christian explanation of man. 'Since ye are brethren, why do ye wrong one another?' 'Ye are members one of another.'

State absolutism is no post-war patent. It was in a free and democratic country that a leading daily journal

had for its motto: 'Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right: but our country right or wrong.' There the spirit of it is, full blown. 'Pride hath budded: the rod hath blossomed.' It is the substance of irreligion, and is the religion of too much of the modern world. It does not begin among the people; they are, however, amazingly suggestible—all of them—and gradually learn to intone the sing-song which propaganda teaches them. It is not the fact that the human race has always relied on wars and will always do so. So said the advocates of cannibalism, dwelling, slavery, piracy, drunkenness, bloodsports, *suttee*, and legalised injustices by the dozen. Human nature uniform? If history teaches anything (except that adventurers learn little from it), it teaches the almost indefinite alterability of man. Man's spiritual climate has been in continual change for over a thousand years. The value placed on the individual and on human life has steadily grown, and is growing in our own day; even in regions where the transgressor is busiest, he is busy producing excuses and apologies, and he tries to make diplomacy and propaganda do more of the work which sword or gun once did. He must convince himself and his people that it is on humane principles, for order and peaceful commerce, that he is reluctantly conducting his expedition, which is either an 'incident' (without declaration of war) or a police measure or a cultural mission. It is meant, and it may even contain 40 per cent. of arguable truth.

'Immoral' episodes have happened since the last war; but analysis will show us, in a cool hour, that some of the breach of law has been more apparent than real. Some of the law has been lawyer's law, drafted at the instance of the possessor. It did not come from anywhere like Mount Sinai, and still less from the eminence where the Beatitudes were spoken. To break it, no doubt, has been tactless, even perhaps dangerous politically. Euripides, however, sings of 'life through the trammellings of law that is not the right' breaking through. And there is a deeper morality, of *life*. It is the biological argument, otherwise the demographic. Populations *as such* possess inherent natural rights, notwithstanding any trespass notice-boards, fences, or 'Seats reserved' for some who

do not fully occupy the seats. Full and wise use constitute ultimate right to anything. A family or a race loses its title-deeds to territory or resources that it cannot populate and cultivate. Does this sound new doctrine? It should not. Of conventional adhesion to any *status quo ante*, nature knows nothing: groups of living beings are either justifying themselves and obeying the first of moral commands, 'Increase and multiply: possess the earth and subdue it'; or they are making room for those who will. Wordsworth noted this law with approval—

'because the good old rule  
Sufficeth them, the simple plan,  
That they should take who have the power,  
And they should keep who can.'

He calls it 'a lesson which is quickly learn'd, a signal this which all can see.' On any long view, it is pathetic when a highly civilised community becomes, either deliberately or constitutionally, more sterile year by year, while some neighbour nations with a less soft and arbitrary 'standard of living' grow in confidence and aim. 'Mo man putteth new wine into old bottles, lest it should burst them.' The morality of the New Testament is parallel with that of natural law, plainly—except no doubt that resettlements in the human sphere should be superintended by good will animating scientific administration, in place of the method of the animal kingdom, invasion and expulsion. Again, we shall have to recover the primal truth that the basic divine blessing to man or nation is not undisturbed, exclusive possession of inherited privilege and property, but children, and more than enough to replace death and wastage; next, *pietas, simplicitas, unitas*; next, enterprise and attachment to the foundational occupations that harness the forces of nature; and finally, faith in their future. 'We live by admiration, hope, and love: blind were we without these.' We all know what happened to the man in the divine parable, who took toward his talent the attitude of 'what I have, I keep intact, taking no risks.' It was the fruitful and the thrusters (men like our Elizabethan and Georgian colonising forefathers) who were commended. Even their ungentle actions subserved a larger purpose they could scarcely foresee: Providence is not always fastidious about the instruments employed in the unending drama of change.

The British peoples are not 'finished.' But they are giving the world that impression. We are not repairing our annual losses by death; we are shrinking, almost more than any people but the French. Our net reproduction rate has sunk to below 0.8, half the replacement rate and a third of the healthy rate. Russia, Italy, Poland, and Ireland are still increasing peoples; and Germany has in the last several years successfully arrested decline and turned it into racial increment. Dr Burgdorfer puts the National Socialist case thus: 'A people can live for ever if they so will. The German people, we believe, have regained that will. We conceive that it may be regained by all Western peoples.' Most investigators agree in attributing this vital decay in English-speaking countries (including northern but not southern Ireland) and in France (but not French Canadians) and South Africa (but not the Boers) not to any organic decadence, but to deliberate interference with the function of procreation; first, by contraceptive measures, subordinately by abortion, and to a still less extent by abstinence from the marital act.

But people have their alleged reasons for these practises; and we must probe for them, compassionately but scientifically. The evidence is overwhelming and convergent that the ethical and general outlook on life is the main differentiating factor. Wherever this is religious or traditional or pastoral or domestic, there the race renews and reinforces itself. Wherever the outlook is predominantly urban, industrial, commercial, suburban, or class, there is the autumn of a race and a winter of the nursery. Peoples, as shown above, of the same blood and origin, living side by side, differ in these vital respects of increase exactly according to their values, ethics, and religion. Racial discontinuance is not willed by nature; it is contrived by men and women. And, more precisely, why? The motives vary, but are closely allied: social advancement, liberation from domestic 'encumbrances,' freedom for mobility, financial security or surplus, the occasional pursuit of pleasure between 7 p.m. and 3 a.m., the craving for appearances or luxury extras, the increased centring of interests outside the home, sometimes the inability to find a meaning in life for a posterity. The irony is that these motives obtain most where the communities have

the most social services and the higher wages and the most indulgent standards of living. And among these, the more comfortable the class, the less is its vital contribution to the ongoing of the race. It would be dishonest to doubt that the car in its garage, the 'class' school, the radio, vacuum cleaner, water-softener, washing machine, the touring holiday, the modern amazing cult of woman's dress, the 'necessity' of the weekly visits to cinema or dance hall, have displaced millions of children. They are with Lamb's Dream-children: 'We are nothing; less than nothing, and dreams. We are only what might have been, and must wait upon the tedious shores of Lethe millions of ages before we have existence, and a name.' Vast sums are expended in advertising many sources of amusement or show, but no advertisement has yet appeared proclaiming that children bring joy into the home, hope into adult lives, safety in the end to a nation. Only an intelligent responsible minority mind these things. They only, and not the sleek and conventional, know what it means presently — increased unemployment through fewer consumers and less demand for goods; the impossible cost of pensions and social services through a contraction of the substance around which the present prodigal administration has been fitted (how shall one worker in the future meet his own responsibilities, and then pay also for two pensioners?); the incapacity to populate our territory or pay for its defence, and the consequent entry into it of an unofficial receiver in the form of a fertile and fertilising Power.

Before we concern ourselves with surface morals and manners, with prescriptive rights and 'legal' titles, let us attend to this the preamble of all morality and to these weightier matters of the law. An intellectual of the Left, with one child or none, must in decency refrain from discussing other races' expansionism as daylight robbery or aggression. There is a moral chasm, which he should humbly realise, between generation and degeneration, between a full cradle and a full vocabulary. Those of us who believe in the English heritage, tradition, and spirit are precisely those who will wish for heirs to these things—a detail which numbers of talkers about them ignore and forget. We shall do well to continue hospitality to refugees of good health and good moral and

social antecedents, contingent upon their accepting British citizenship with all its obligations, and upon their not further overcrowding the already congested professions, the tertiary and luxury trades, and occupying the avenues where easy toll is taken. A tremendous shifting is overdue in the emphasis which has been put upon receiving benefits and taking profits, in favour of giving service and duty. An equally certain revision will be rendered obligatory by world currents, in that precarious convention called the 'standard of living,' which is not a principle grounded in law or the nature of things, but only a regionally agreed whim, so long as funds last. The bogey of poverty or reduced scale of living (by which most of us mean having less than our neighbour, or less than taste has come to insist upon) is exposed by a simple consideration of the valuable Britons who have been bred in households that were fuller of children than of gear or cash. The patter which makes an antithesis between quantity and quality is impeached as insincere by the facts, which show the sixth child has more 'go' and better prospects than the first and second. But people can always invent 'reasons' for their social preferences, and considerable hypocrisy shields itself behind the terminology of advanced thought and anti-racial practice. It is to the credit of the so-called dictators that they saw at least through *this* pretence and stopped the course of barrenness.

With us, race salvation will need an honest facing of the facts and a moral revival to reverse the rush away from life and the life-bringing pursuits. We should not want a civilisation of hard-pressed industrialism, of anxious genteel suburbanism, or distaste for the open places. We shall not have it if we wanted it. It is receiving unmistakable notices to quit—or to retrieve the former English secret, of plain living in the affections and toil without trivial worship of appearance; that warm, human living which produced Raleigh, More, Blake (who as a young man bred up six brothers and sisters), Cromwell, Johnson, Clive, Nelson, Wesley, Cobbett, Burns, Wordsworth, Livingstone, all of whom knew the 'life intense and frugal.' A genius, a saviour of his country, may be the ninth or tenth child: if he is, to-day we are very unlikely ever to have him. Our tinkering and

obstructions do not give nature a fair chance. 'There was no room in the inn.'

It is of no use hoping that someone at some time will do something interesting about something, or putting ourselves off with the polite cheat that things will last our time. We are being watched. It is as well that we should know what is being watched. It is a *crise de natalite*.

W. J. BLYTON.

## SOME RECENT BOOKS.

- The New Testament.** Translated by William Tyndale, 1534.  
**The History of 'The Times.'**  
**History of the Great War—Military Operations.** Wilfred Miles.  
**The Soviet Comes of Age.**  
**Cylinder Seals.** H. Frankfort.  
**Animal Carvings in British Churches.** M. D. Anderson.  
**The Rise of George Canning.** Dorothy Marshall.  
**Clive of Plassey.** A. Mervyn Davies.  
**Lord North.** W. Baring Pemberton.  
**Benjamin Franklin.** Carl van Doren.  
**The Enigma of James II.** Malcolm V. Hay.  
**The Life of S. T. Coleridge : The Early Years.** Lawrence Hanson.  
**Beethoven.** Walter Riezler.  
**The Heart Ever Faithful.** L. G. Bachmann.  
**Survey of London.** St Pancras.  
**History of the Royal Pavilion, Brighton.** Henry D. Roberts.  
**Charcot of the Antarctic.** Marthe Oulie.  
**Henry Luke Paget.** Mrs Paget.  
**Constitutional Year Book.**  
**Anglo-Jewish Letters, 1158-1927.** Cecil Roth.  
**Passing of the Aborigines.** Daisy Bates.  
**Shakespeare's Boy Actors.** W. Robertson Davies.  
**Costume and Fashion.** Herbert Norris.  
**Traumatic Mental Disorders.** W. A. Brend.  
**Serengeti.** Audrey Moore.  
**Life Within Reason.** Ivor Brown.  
**Manx Memories and Movements.** Samuel Norris.  
**Marshland Calling.** S. L. Ben-  
 susan.  
**Portrait of a Chef.** Helen Morris.

ONE's heart leaps with gladness and is warm with gratitude at realising the value and beauty of the impression of 'The New Testament translated by William Tyndale, 1534,' which, edited by Mr N. Hardy Wallis, the University Press of Cambridge has published at the instance of the Royal Society of Literature. To describe its qualities or do justice to its helpfulness to the English literary and religious worlds is almost beyond the scope of oratory and scholarship. It is so full a work, so richly full. The original conception of this enterprise came from Mr Isaac Foot, who contributes to the volume an Introduction of particular value, as besides proving the call for the work it summarizes the troubles of exile, poverty and hunger, with persecutions and 'hard fightings' in which Tyndale made his translation and afterwards revised it, thereby to increase the natural poetry of phrasing and make the whole a work of familiar and everlasting appeal to the heart, and to himself a continuous and noble monument. His Testament was at once the product of scholarly genius and holy sincerity. Those who have given of

their learning, thought and skill to the making of this volume, deserve most earnest thanks, while the footnotes comparing the first version of 1525 with this final rendering, have an interest which others besides those learned in theology and biblical history can profit by and enjoy.

The second volume of 'The History of "The Times"' subtitled, 'The Tradition Established' (written, printed, and published at the office of 'The Times') covers what may be called the Delane epoch, as his great figure overshadows all others for most of the years 1841-1884 dealt with. Yet the potent figure of John Walter III, though more in the background, is also of supreme importance, as he, the Chief Proprietor, was the final court of appeal and had the last word in the organization and policy of the paper. The period covered the Crimean, American Civil, and Franco-Prussian Wars, the Indian Mutiny and the ministries of Peel, Aberdeen, Palmerston, Disraeli, and Gladstone. It also saw the arrival of Reuters and the growth of the telegraph system which revolutionized the transmission and distribution of news, and the ending of the stamp duty which did so much to pave the way for rival papers at lower prices to challenge the hitherto undisputed supremacy of 'The Times'. At the end of the Crimean War Lord John Russell in bitterness wrote: 'If England is ever to be England again, this vile tyranny of "The Times" must be cut off.' It was not cut off, though through the influence of the astute Palmerston, curbed and turned into lines more agreeable to the Government. Again and again during that period, in Parliament, in the press and in correspondence the question was raised. Who is to decide on the dividing line between information which in a democracy should be given to the public that sound opinion may be formed, and information which in the public interest should be kept secret? In the Crimean War Sir William Russell's despatches were powerful in opening the eyes of the public to abuses; but did they not also give useful information to the Russians? This problem of how much can be said still exists and many may think that Delane went too far in his claims for the Press. Subject after subject dealing with the growth, influence and conduct of the Press could be illuminated from this volume, but space forbids. It only remains to congratulate the

anonymous authors on their able, valuable and absorbingly interesting volume.

'Nothing further remains to be said at the Day of Judgment,' remarked Mr Gladstone of Purcell's *Life of Cardinal Manning*. If there be a final Day of Judgment for British wars, the Recording Angel may make the same remark about the '**History of the Great War—Military Operations**' (Macmillan), at any rate so far as facts and evidence are concerned, even though there will still be discussion as to the conclusions. The latest instalment, '**France and Belgium, 1916, II,**' is entirely occupied with the battle of the Somme after the opening day; 650 pages, admirably enlightened by plans and sketches and with a whole book of maps in addition. Twelve similar volumes have already appeared and the end is not yet. The skill, patient industry, editorial arrangement and comprehensiveness of the work are worthy of all admiration. For this latest volume Captain Wilfred Miles is responsible under the general direction of Sir James Edmonds; and Major Becke as before contributes the maps. Week by week, day by day and often hour by hour the story is developed of that terrific struggle which often promised so much and yet somehow failed to reach achievement. To deal adequately in so small a space with this immense volume is impossible; but if the keynote be sought it may be found in the introduction:

'Pledged to loyal cooperation with an Ally to whose tactical methods he [Haig] could not do otherwise than conform, he was obliged to launch his offensive before he considered that his forces were fit and ready to do so, and in a region and under conditions which were not of his own choosing. His amateur army was committed to the attack of semi-permanent fortifications constructed and held by a professional army; yet it bit deep into these positions and inflicted upon the enemy a moral and material loss from which he never fully recovered.'

While we accept absolutely the word of the publishers that '**The Soviet comes of Age**' (William Hodge) is not propaganda, it is no denial of their assertion to say that it really gives only the better side of a striking case. Twenty-eight of the foremost citizens of the U.S.S.R., as the title page puts it, have written on as many aspects

of the progress of Soviet Russia. Mainly these chapters describe the industrial and scientific new conditions there, with chapters added on the arts and athletics which are carefully associated with the politics of the communistic empire. The other side of the story, which tells of human regimentations and oppressions, the tyrannous crushing of personal rights, the incessant spies, the bureaucracy with its one idea, to establish collective security, is left alone; although it all is necessary to the full truth, and omission modifies the assuring effect of this forceful and well-illustrated volume, which the Webbs, in their eternally gracious, benevolent and nicely partial spirit, contentedly bless.

Students of the ancient civilizations of Asia, under the guidance of Rawlinson, Layard, and others, have long been aware of the help gained from, and given by, the impressions of seals that were dug up with other buried treasures in Mesopotamia. There should be, therefore, a ready interest for the learned volume on 'Cylinder Seals' (Macmillan), which, after long search in the regions where they were preserved, Dr H. Frankfort of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago has written. His documentary essay, with its many illustrations covering the long vague period from prehistoric times—when the gods and legendary heroes as well as strange, fantastic animals filled much of human thought with superstition and fears—to the twelfth century before Christ, treats with all possible thoroughness the developments of art and religion in the ancient Near East, with their offshoots to Persia and Egypt. Conjecture certainly has to be largely exercised over the persons and their significance as represented on the seals: but that is inevitable in revisiting the ages when thought was loose and science almost a monopoly of the alchemists and astrologers. Dr Frankfort, in the spirit of a worthy man of science, has faced the difficulties frankly, and not only requickenened interest in an important early branch of research, but drawn aside some of the curtains which shrouded mankind in the periods when it was groping its ways towards domestic comfort, dignity and sovereignty.

Miss M. D. Anderson, who has already studied helpfully the ideals and methods of the medieval carver, opens

up a curious chapter of artistic and historical interest in her little book on **'Animal Carvings in British Churches'** (Cambridge University Press). Helped by many illustrations she brings before her readers, as an excellent guide to the subject should do, the curious carvings of all manners of creatures, birds, beasts, and fishes, natural, grotesque, legendary, and symbolical, with fabulous beings and human monstrosities, and points their romantic or religious and artistic significance. Evidently her search for examples has taken her to all parts of England, and her trouble has been worth while. Her little book opens the eyes to the natural, curious, and absurd among animals and mankind, as they appeared to the eyes and imaginations of the credulous or worshipful folk of our Middle Ages.

This is a day for biographers. Every historic personality is getting its re-valuation, a process that in many cases was required. Canning has been one of the less understood of British statesmen, probably through his own bold divergencies in the battlefield of politics that in his day was bitterly fought. While his political ideas and purposes get ample expression in the pages of Dr Dorothy Marshall's **'The Rise of George Canning'** (Longmans), the man himself is hardly more clearly seen therein than before. Miss Marshall has been more fortunate in the material available to her than were Canning's earlier biographers; as she has had access to numerous unpublished letters as well as to his journals and the correspondence with his wife which reveal almost to the last degree his thoughts and hopes of things political. Her work will be valuable to future historians; but we wish that, with all its revelations of Canning's purposes and his relations with Pitt, who was one of his good angels, and with Fox, Burke, Sheridan, and the other chief actors on that historic stage, we had seen more of the brilliant being whose practical jokes, witty verses and other *jeux d'esprit* made him a happy exception among the ponderous statesmen—though not all of them were heavy—of his time. Most of the letters here published were dull; even those describing the progress of his love for Joan Scott, whom he married, having something of the flavour of a blue-book. But we must not give the impression that Miss Marshall's work is not interesting, for it is so through

the political facts it details and explains. We see Canning ambitious and painstaking in his apprenticeship to Parliamentary life, and leave him heart-broken beside the grave of his beloved Pitt; while he faces the tasks and opportunities that were to lead him to the Premiership and then, four months afterwards, to his death.

A frank and full biography of 'Clive of Plassey' (Nicholson and Watson) was called for, and, with some possible touches of prejudice, it has come from the pen of Mr A. Mervyn Davies, whose labours in preparing and writing this volume have surely been prodigious; for the truths of Clive's career were tangled and obscure and it surely needed much industry to unravel that considerable tale of dark intrigue and bold action as Mr Davies has done. The amazing impossibilities of the East in that time, with the young clerks of the East India Company, when luck or trickery enabled them to do so, pocketing riches beyond the dreams of avarice and retiring after a few years as Nabobs, add strangeness to a scene of over-jewelled splendour, treachery and blood. Clive outdid his fellows in all ways, because his military gifts and character, which the most ardent of his critics could not justly question, though Mr Davies seems partly to explain them away, served the opportunity as the opportunity served him. His achievements were chequered and Mr Davies appears almost to enhance them through painting his faults in heavy shadow. It is easy to blame Clive for the many short-comings which prevent his name from being honoured and loved; but his origins were unpromising, his times were especially corrupt and lacking in ideals, and he did as his fellows did, with more than their customary boldness and energy. His was a pathetic story of too much glory, with discredit and failure at the end. Mr Davies is able to cast doubt on the old belief in Clive's suicide; but his last years were wretched enough for anything.

The present-day game of re-estimating judgments on prominent historical figures goes happily on. Yesterday's hero often is seen to have been feeble and futile, while men who had been darkly treated since they died are brought to an edited apotheosis. It certainly, therefore, is the turn of 'Lord North' (Longmans), whose restoration after a century of notorious detraction is

brought about, cautiously but not unconvincingly, by Mr W. Baring Pemberton.

'North's long and devoted services to his country; his laborious husbanding of her resources; his patient efforts to purify the springs of the East India Company; his sacrifice to duty of that freedom from responsibility for which he sighed lie buried beneath the tombstone which pitifully recalls the passing of Britain's first Empire. His epitaph is brutally brief: "The Minister who lost America."'

As, of course, North partly did; for others, in America as well as at home, helped him to do it. The trouble was that, like every other person but Washington and Franklin, concerned in that struggle, he was not big enough for his job, while also he was hampered throughout by a disloyal Opposition and that vague but actual condition in political as in private life called ill-luck. His kindness, wit, freedom from vindictiveness, geniality and unselfishness entitled him to an honourable reputation: but give a statesman a bad name and it sticks, as it has stuck to Frederick North. Mr Pemberton has done his work as well as his subject and the difficult times wherein North laboured permit. He follows the tendencies that already are in flow to re-establish George III, but clearly cannot overcome his dislike of Pitt. In spirit, as well as in its survey of facts, this biography is carefully just, and should cause a number of well-established historians to estimate anew the judgments on North which they had borrowed or come to.

We come next to a larger arena in the same quarrel and to a richer personality with this life of '**Benjamin Franklin**' (Putnam), which is not only the adequate biography of a very great man; but a vivid chapter of Anglo-American history. Mr Carl van Doren, in painting the infinite brilliance and natural, warm shadows of Franklin's career and character, has realised the man in his times with trustworthy imagination and truth. Looking back on the events of that period and international catastrophe one feels with abiding sadness the pity that Franklin's inspired common sense, unresting industry, political vision and eager desire that the right might prevail could not save his ideal of an enlightened Empire which, if the probably impossible might have

occurred, would have found the United States of America to this day a proud free partner of the British Commonwealth under the spiritual grace of the Crown. But that was not to be. Although Chatham, Burke, and Fox supported him, Franklin was beaten by the want of political insight and liberality elsewhere, aided by the forces of envious placemen. Out of that turmoil he won a position second not even to that occupied by Washington, and remained meanwhile an eager student in all branches of science, making the world safer and more comfortable through his discoveries and inventions. Happily, he also had the frailties which proved him humanly lovable. This is a large book, enlightening and in many ways great, being written with imagination and filling a considerable canvas convincingly. Out of its fullness Franklin lives and moves through the world in a humorous mastery of it. 'Sometimes, with his marvellous range, in spite of his personal tang, he seems to have been more than any single man: a harmonious human multitude.' What he did and what he represented will now be better understood.

We are transported to an earlier scene. It is easy to believe that injustice has been done to the motives and character of James II, largely through the religious or political prejudices of past historians; those prejudices being rather unconscious than determinative. It is natural, therefore, that Mr Malcolm V. Hay's '*The Enigma of James II*' (Sands), should be written to redress the wrong done to the last of our Stuart Kings. Unfortunately the author falls into some of the excesses of the historians he rejects. Gilbert Burnet, for instance, whom he especially dislikes, was, he declares, a twister and a time-server, who 'usually spoke the truth when deception could serve no purpose,' also, he had his malicious moments. At the same time William of Orange was a humbug, a hypocrite and so on. All this reminds us that James and William came to their difference at a most bitter time and its historians, in painting the characters in black and white, inevitably dipped their pens in gall. Mr Hay would have given better support to his case of making-out James to be tolerant in religion and, though without his brother's kingcraft, a well-meaning monarch and most serviceable to the future British Navy, if he had told his tale with

more simplicity, offering such testimony as came from the helpful William Penn, and without 'answering back.' In spite of this work, James remains an enigma. His pitiless treatment of the humiliated Monmouth reveals one trait, among others, which would spoil Mr Hay's portrait of him, and are left aside. Yet with all that, it is time that, while the enigma still is there, the blackness of the shadows heaped around the unhappy James should be diminished. He was the victim of his race and time and historical fashions.

Mr Lawrence Hanson's '*The Life of S. T. Coleridge : The Early Years*' (Allen and Unwin), promises when it is complete to be worthy of a place beside Dr Harper's biography of Wordsworth, than which praise cannot be higher. It is thorough and with all its sympathy for 'the rapt one with the godlike forehead' in his fleeting greatnesses and abiding and abundant weaknesses, is truthful. One does not quite realise from these pages why Coleridge so absolutely charmed many of those he met; yet that he did so is proved by his winning the hearts of Dorothy Wordsworth and Sara Hutchinson, while he impressed Lamb and Wordsworth with his intellectual and imaginative powers and gained solid tributes of practical help from the Wedgwoods and Poole. This volume reveals him in his more romantic period, when his genius had its first expression, and although his slackness and tendency to leave good intentions unfulfilled, with his almost unconscious desertions of his wife, were already evident, he had not come to the looseness of the later years that was so pathetic, because of the possibilities lost through his own indisciplines. Skilfully we are shown the beginnings of the philosopher and theologian, with sidelights that suggest his brilliance as a conversationalist through which he captured the admiration of all sorts of women and men. Possibly it would have been best if he had remained with Stuart working on the '*Morning Post*' in which he showed himself, for the times, a brilliant journalist—but who can tell with such as S. T. C. We leave him at the end of those early years, with his wife and family travelling northwards to the Wordsworth's and look forward to renewing this study in a concluding volume.

In his introduction to Walter Riezler's study of

'Beethoven' (M. C. Forrester), Herr Furtwängler asserts that perhaps no other German is held in such reverence throughout the world, and that in his music there is a spiritual force unique. No one, surely, can speak with more authority on Beethoven than Furtwängler, and no one who has absorbed the spirit and realised the mighty mastership of the symphonies, the Masses, and so much else in that output of power which belongs now to the immortalities can do other than feel the truth of it. This is pre-eminently a work for the musician or for the hearer who has got something of the inward purposes of Beethoven into his being. Steadily and in order Herr Riezler takes the works and studies their musical and spiritual significance, incidentally, as he does so, revealing the ways in which the master brought his impressions and inspirations to fruition. What is the essence of Beethoven, and what do his works mean?—that is the double purpose of this enquiry, answered with careful explanations pointed by biographical incidents and comparisons with the achievements of the other world-creators in music. That Beethoven had an heroic spirit, though marred by his infirmity of deafness and his boisterous angers, is realised, and the 'opera,' as here expounded, prove it. To unlock the heart of genius may be beyond the possibilities; but even to get nearer to its secrets is worth the effort; and this work, the labour of forty years, successfully does that.

Miss L. G. Bachmann's tender and spiritually imaginative (and incidentally well-translated) '**The Heart Ever Faithful**' (G. E. J. Coldwell), tells the very human story of John Sebastian Bach, from his appointment as Cantor at the Church and School of St Thomas in Leipzig to his triumphant end, when, though old and blind, in his dying rapture he heard the choristers of Heaven chanting his great Mass and his St Matthew's Passion. Those were crucial years to Bach, full of turmoil and vicissitudes, domestic and professional; yet throughout them he gathered inspiration and wrought stedfastly, and not only was able to write exalting music, but maintained his ideals. He kept to his purpose jealously and so triumphed that beyond others he has become the musician's master of music. In this romance, the reasons why he attained that eminence are attractively brought

out, and as John Sebastian Bach, the divine choirmaster with his many musical sons, has gathered innumerable followers to his name, the enjoyment of this book should be widespread.

The Nineteenth Volume of the '**Survey of London**' (L.C.C. and P. S. King and Son, Ltd.) has now appeared and increases further the debt which all students of London owe to its County Council for this enterprise. The new volume covers the parish of St Pancras, including the area between the foot of West Hill in the north and old St Pancras church, with the Regent's Park Terraces, at the south. The information given is comprehensive and illuminating, while the illustrations are notable, especially the panoramic drawings of Mr J. F. King, showing St Pancras as it was before the coming of the railways. We begin with the green fields and woods which in old days were so delightfully accessible, even to central London, and end with the imposing architecture of Nash's Terraces, which, in spite of all the sad destruction of Regency and other work during recent years, still happily remain with us, though divided by many miles of bricks and mortar from the open country which they, so essentially urban in type, then bordered. Mr Percy Lovell and Mr W. McB. Marcham, who are mainly responsible for this volume, are to be congratulated on their careful and comprehensive studies.

No student of the later Georgian period or visitor to Brighton can ignore the Royal Pavilion, that Classical-Georgian-Chinese-Tartar-Hindu palace which George IV built for himself at a cost, including furniture and decoration, of £500,000, a large proportion of which was indirectly contributed by the country which had to pay its Sovereign's debts. Much has been written about this remarkable house but never with such authority and information gathered into one volume as in Mr Henry D. Roberts' '**History of the Royal Pavilion, Brighton**' (Country Life), written at the request of and with the special encouragement of the Corporation of Brighton. We are given an interesting account of the development and glorification of what was the ordinary small house of Mr Weltje, the Royal cook, into the grandiose ostentation of George's residence with its oriental splendour and exotic decoration. It remained a favoured

residence of William IV but lost that favour under Queen Victoria and the Prince Consort. Stripped of its furnishings and decoration, the building reached its nadir. Thereafter, owing to the keenness of the Brighton authorities who had bought it, much of its furniture was recovered and the whole building rejuvenated and made a source of pride to the town, so that it holds now an important place in the civic life. The illustrations are notable and the whole volume is produced in the admirable style which we have come to expect from 'Country Life.'

'A great man had entered into History.' In such words Marthe Oulié, a seawoman as well as the author of 'Charcot of the Antarctic' (Murray), rounds-off her biography of the French sailor who in the Great War also commanded for a time a British fighting-ship. It is a romantic story of one born to the seas who, although the fulfilment of his natural wish by his brilliant father's request was postponed until he had become a qualified doctor of medicine, went to their service the moment he gained his degree. He had means as well as the gifts of the born navigator and explorer, and in his famous vessel the 'Pourquoi Pas?' and other ships made expeditions to the Antarctic, to Greenland, and elsewhere. Mlle Oulié in her natural wish to realise the personal fineness of Jean Charcot tells us less of his geographical and scientific achievements than we should like to have known. But in view of the limited space at her disposal, she did rightly in dwelling chiefly on his character. Charcot's straightforwardness and kindness, his tenderness to all creatures and especially birds—as for the seagull that lived in his cabin and the penguins, whose seeming humanity so amused him that from his interest in them Anatole France gained the inspiration that went to his 'Ile des Pingouins'—are true parts of his tale; while his adventurous courage and genius for seamanship make his example one for men to be proud of and to live by.

Mrs Paget has written an unusual ecclesiastical biography. So many of its kind have been dull as ditch-water through the subject being shown mainly as an official of the Church, enrobed, pompous, ponderous, and in his superior intellectuality not highly intelligent. With 'Henry Luke Paget' (Longmans) all that is happily different; but then he—whom this writer knew in the

St Pancras years—was utterly unlike the majority of sacerdotal bigwigs whose careers have been rather mentally oppressive than humanly uplifting. Luke Paget was ever a citizen joyously alive. The spirit of trusting and affectionate brotherliness which made him a centre of religious success in London, West-central and East, went with him to wherever his duties carried him. Possibly the word 'wonderful' was too often on his lips and his enthusiasm, like that of Scott Holland, might sometimes have appeared rather too close to the ecstatic; yet he was unmistakeably and ever sincere, and the eagerness of the man and priest could only be measured in high terms. His wife in this Life has written a pastoral record which brings out the truth that the most valuable service to social and religious life comes from such loving, self-giving personalities as was his.

The fifty-third edition of the '**Constitutional Year Book**' (Harrison) keeps to the high level of instructiveness, comprehensiveness and arrangement maintained by its predecessors. Notable in this issue is the further information provided about Government departments and bodies of an official character. We are given biographical notes of members of both the Houses of Parliament and a guide to general elections going back for over a century, and are regaled with statistics of commerce, finance, employment, customs duties, industrial production, population and social services. If a reader wants to know how to get a vote; what subjects the different ministerial departments deal with; what societies are concerned in his special lines of interest; by how large a majority his M.P. was elected; who was the Prime Minister a century ago; which bishops are in the House of Lords and which are not; who is on the Army Council or who is the Chief Commissioner of Panth Piploda; when the Queensland Legislative Council was abolished or that of New South Wales was created, and on countless other questions, let him consult this valuable work of reference.

An unusual aspect on international history is revealed by Mr Cecil Roth in his collection of '**Anglo-Jewish Letters: 1158-1927**' (Soncino Press). The publication is welcome for its own literary reasons; but it is not surprising to find in it also a justified purpose, as is shown

by the second letter that appears and the last. The former, written at the instance of Richard I, details the liberties granted to the Jews settled in England and the last contains the Balfour declaration on their National Home in Palestine, set down in the famous communication to Lord Rothschild; while half-way through this extensive series we have one from a country clergyman pointing out to William Pitt the rights of the ideal that is now called Zionist, with a hint on the necessity therefore of maintaining a serviceable British Navy. The persons and interests in this epistolary progress are often important, as it includes letters written on Jewish concerns by or to Henry VIII, George III, and other Kings; Dr Ruy Lopez, who was politically murdered in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; Dan Mendoza the prize-fighter, 'Israel Bar Abraham Lord George Gordon' (as he called himself), sundry ambassadors, doctors, merchants, lovers and annoyed parents, and concludes with characteristic communications from the Disraelis and Israel Zangwill. Indirectly the volume gives direct testimony to the great good wrought by the settlements of cultured and enterprising Jews, and makes one the more lament that such qualities and benefits as they established have been so cruelly repaid elsewhere with envies, vileness, rapacities and bloody death.

Mrs Daisy Bates is to be numbered with the remarkable women of the world and the volume describing her stay of thirty-five years with the original natives of Australia is bound to become and to remain what is called a standard work. 'The Passing of the Aborigines' (Murray) is not only a volume that describes intimately and with authority the lives and ways of those primitives; but unlike most other books of anthropological appeal, happens to be written with love for its subjects. What a picture it shows—not only of those few, scattered human remnants of the first inhabitants of Australia with their dying numbers, skill and customs, but also of 'Kabarli,' their 'grandmother,' Mrs Bates herself, prim in her stiff European clothes of an early post-Victorian fashion, carrying healing to them and the gladness that sustains. This is a vivid and pathetic book: yet in its revelation of simple and modest gallantry, devotion and ideals, worthy of a place among the records of the truly heroic.

The boys who enacted feminine rôles in the presentation of Shakespeare's plays have often been the subjects of curious conjecture, pointed by the poet's own references to them, especially that made through the mouth of the Egyptian queen to some squeaking Cleopatra. Mr W. Robertson Davies, if he does not entirely satisfy such curiosity, is certainly interesting in his '**Shakespeare's Boy Actors**' (Dent). He not only details their peculiar record and the strength and weaknesses of their purpose and interpretations of girlhood and womanhood; but suggests ways in which possibly the dramatist fitted his parts to their capacities so that they should keep within the realities of their scenes. Sometimes Mr Davies appears rather to force his theories too far; as where he says that Shakespeare never trusted a boy actor with a death-scene. But surely Desdemona was played by a boy because she had to sing her moving Willow song and only a boy's voice could make that sound womanly. Elsewhere he says that Queen Katharine's death-scene is the only one 'given to a woman in any Shakespearian play, except for those cases where women die by violence.' It is true that Cleopatra's death is self-ministered, but it is not violent and her exit from life is the most beautiful and poignant in any play. We would not, however, leave the suggestion of general wrongness in this book, which is judicious and admirable in its style and suggestions.

With the publication of his two fine volumes on Dress in the Tudor period, Mr Herbert Norris carries his illustrated account of '**Costume and Fashion**' (Dent) a long march forward. He has already dealt with Dress, in its most varied aspects, through earlier ages to the time of Bosworth Field and later, with a collaborator, through the nineteenth century. So that with the instalments promised and in hand on the Stuart and Hanoverian periods, an ambitious effort is approaching its completion. The work, on the whole, is admirable. Its author has brought to it not only the interest of the experienced scholar but the eyes and hand of the artist; and few of the illustrations, whether in black-and-white or colour, are not of his own drawing, several well-known portraits of historical figures having been adapted by him to the particular illumination of his text. So that besides observing how fashions changed in a brilliantly-clothed

time, with Elizabethans pointing with jewels the costly raiments and brave colours they loved, we have also a series of portraits of the greater persons of that greatest of English ages, with enough of their stories and characteristics described to make the book an arm-chair companion as well as a record of the beauties, fancies, and fads of clothing in an unusually picturesque age.

Dr W. A. Brend brings an unusual authority to his survey of the medical evidence and procedure in civil actions fought to settle the compensatory rights of sufferers from '**Traumatic Mental Disorders**' (Heinemann) due to the effects of war or to accidents caused during the processes of their work, as besides being a fully qualified doctor of medicine, etc., he is a barrister-at-law and has served as the officially appointed medical referee under no less than fifteen different judges. What, therefore, he has to say on that legal and psychological subject is expert; while the evidence he brings of mentally disordered and nervous cases, with the malingerer intervening, is clear enough to interest normal readers. It seems that reforms or alterations are being called for with some justification. A medical referee is certainly required in most of such cases; for although a judge, counsel or jurymen can estimate fairly accurately the effect of a crippled limb or the loss of a finger or foot, it is another matter to appraise the effects of shock or an abiding nervousness. At the same time, the lawyer and the medical man, while each desires clear thinking, approach such questions with opposite principles in mind. 'Law is a code of rules, and the code is the lawyer's horizon; medicine is a science, and scientific thinking knows no boundaries.' That apothegm illustrates the difficulties that exist in the province of uncertainties surveyed in this volume, which assuredly is necessary to those who wish to amend or alter the procedure as established.

'**Serengeti**' (Country Life) is the name of the Game Sanctuary in northern Tanganyika of which Captain M. S. Moore, V.C., is the Ranger. With the serious poachings of African tribes and European hunters and the depredations of locusts and hunting dogs as well as with the troubles that come from drought and fires, both he and his wife, whose pen, as this book shows, is as effective as his rifle and tact must be, have plenty to do and to think

of the whole year round. To those suited to the life, as they are, it must be next door to a vigorous paradise; but its exactions would be too much for those not eager to live in that next door. But the Moores have enthusiasm and a great love for wild things generally, admiring the grace and skill of the creatures, recognising the wisdom and bounties of Nature and only showing some uncertainty when it comes to the hyæna, which Mrs Moore concludes was created by God in despondency. It is well that even at this late hour there should be generous game reserves in Africa and elsewhere; for they serve to protect much precious animal life. Serengeti seems especially rich in specimens. Elephants, lions, leopards, baboons, monkeys, porcupine, giraffes, zebras, and antelopes of almost infinite kinds share that close territory with birds and snakes. Mrs Moore apparently thinks well even of pythons. That is a gracious spirit, as this is an enjoyable book, and, not only because the profits of publication will go to improving the water-supply for the animals in the Serengeti National Game Park, we commend it.

The Liberal Book Club has issued a little volume from the pen of Mr Ivor Brown which merits the attention of all who cleave to democracy—as most Britons do—as the best of practical principles by which a modern people may be governed. In *'Life Within Reason'* (Nicholson and Watson), Mr Brown covers no new ground. He restates the old ideals and the new practices—that also are old practices—which have made the lives of many Germans, Italians and Russians hardly worth living. Brutality, evil systems of espionage and constant threats to peace, abroad and at home, stand in the ways not only of their personal liberty but of their happiness: while all the world trembles over the possibilities of a dictator's nod. In retelling the truths of democratic purposes and conditions, with all the faults and wrongs that have gone to the progress of the system, Mr Brown speaks out clearly and fearlessly, and shows how, with our indifference or carelessness, as in the processes of mistaken peace-making at Versailles, we have much to mend, and something to undo. It is high time that we took these familiar thoughts really to heart.

Forty-five years ago Mr Samuel Norris settled in the

Isle of Man and began there as journalist and a public-spirited citizen a career which is described in '**Manx Memories and Movements**' (Norris Modern Press, Douglas). It is easily possible to regard the Island as merely a place for holiday-makers with certain old institutions, privileges and customs to be maintained for old-sake's sake. The author is able effectually to enlarge that idea. The Isle of Man has its own jealously-guarded nationhood, and Mr Norris has been a leading champion of its rights. Faced by a super-conservative Governor, who in season and out of it seems to have resisted actively those rights, he fought for them with a champion's zest, and in this book tells his tale of the stress, including imprisonment, that was involved, before eventual triumph. While his narrative appeals especially to Manx citizens, it also has an interest to all who recognise the necessity of upholding the principles of national and civic freedom throughout these islands.

Mr S. L. Bensusan's series of Essex sketches, based on the actualities that can be improved by artistic touches of fiction, has come to its ninth volume with '**Marshland Calling**' (Routledge), and such a series is an excellent encouragement for true and good work done. Essex is changing rapidly, as the bungalows with rubberoid roofs occupy places where the black-headed gulls searched for the cockles hidden in the sands. Well, so it must be, it seems, with that misunderstood condition called Progress knocking at the doors and crowding the air with jazz. Readers of Mr Bensusan will find this volume as happy and good as anything that has come from his pen. In its thirty-five sketches or stories, comedy and tragedy, in neither case of a monotonous kind, are found; with those touches of insight that are characteristic of this genial, observant, and gentle-hearted writer.

Alexis Soyer belonged so absolutely to the eccentric, extravagant age in which he flourished that Miss Helen Morris's life of him, this '**Portrait of a Chef**' (Cambridge University Press), is not merely the biography of an extraordinary individual but the record of a period when the world of fashion could enjoy itself vigorously, eating, drinking, spending money and borrowing it, making merry or making mischief with a bountifulness, airs, and in ways which to our present conditions seem

strangely irresponsible. The Deluge had not then fallen. The trouble in estimating the work and character of Soyer is that he was so many-sided—'a veritable Pooh-Bah'—a genius in his kitchen, inventing dishes and utensils with the ardour and originality of a Leonardo, while at the same time valuable in his relations with the social and practical life about him. He knew everybody and was naturally the equal of all. He did thousands of things; provided the Reform Club with the most savoury period of its history, established his restaurant and named it 'The Gastronomic Symposium of All Nations'—for even in his simplicities he had to be magnificent—wrote his verses, carried out his little jokes, designed and decorated, went out to the Crimea to help in the organisation of the soldiers' kitchens there; was indeed

'A man so various that he seemed to be  
Not one, but all mankind's epitome,'

but altogether different in spirit from the worthless Buckingham of whom those lines were written. With all his eccentricities, Soyer was a good and lovable man, and Miss Morris brings out the truths of him brilliantly.

# INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND VOLUME OF THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of  
articles are printed in italics.]

## A.

- Abbott, Claud Colleer, 'Boswell  
Papers found at Fettercairn: A  
Catalogue of Papers relating to  
Boswell, Johnson and Sir William  
Forbes,' 77, 80-81.
- Aberdeen, 4th Earl of, 63.
- Acton, Lord, 'Historical Essays and  
Studies,' 157-253-254.
- Adams, John, 226, 228.
- von Aehrenthal, Baron A. L., 161,  
170.
- Ahmed III, and Moldavia and Wal-  
lachia, 310.
- Alexander I of Russia, 47.
- Alington, Very Rev. C., 'A Plea  
for a Plan,' 221.
- Anatomy of Intelligence, The,  
299-307.
- Ancient Classics in a Modern  
World, 221-234.
- Anderson, M. D., 'Animal Carvings  
in British Churches,' 359-360.
- Arita, Mr, on Japanese Aims, 294.
- Arnold, Sir Edwin, 'Light of Asia,'  
20.
- Arnold, Matthew, 231,
- Austin, Alfred, 20.

## B.

- Bachmann, L. G., 'The Heart Ever  
Faithful,' 365-366.
- 'Background to Modern Science,'  
187-188.
- Vol. 272.—No. 540.

- von Baden, Prince Max, and the  
Kaiser's abdication, 11.
- Baldwin, Earl, 60-62, 193.
- Balfour, late Earl, 109.
- Barrie, J. M., 26.
- Barthou, M., 171.
- Bates, Daisy, 'The Passing of the  
Aborigines,' 369.
- Beardsley, Aubrey, 18.
- Benn, Sir Ernest, J.P., 'Debt (Pri-  
vate and Public, Good and Bad),'  
259, 261, 263-268, 283.
- Benson, E. F., 27.
- Bensusan, S. L., 'Marshland Call-  
ing,' 373.
- Bentham, Jeremy, 189-190.
- Berdyaev, Nicolas, 'Solitude and  
Society,' 184-185—'The Meaning  
of History,' 248, 252-253.
- Berger, Dr Hans, 304.
- von Bernhardt, General, 'Germany  
and the Next War,' 10.
- von Beseler, Dora, 'The Kaiser:  
Octogenarian,' 1.
- von Bethmann Hollweg, Herr, 10.
- Beveridge, Sir William, 260-261.
- Bismarck, 2-3, 50, 52-53, 56-57, 63,  
158, 170, 312.
- Blackburn, Dr J. M., 303.
- Blue Books, History in, 45-63.
- Blum, Leon, 171.
- Blyton, W. J., 'The Roots of a  
Nation,' 342.
- Books, Some Recent, 173-188, 356-  
374.

- Booth, General William, 'In Darkest England and the Way Out,' 22.  
 Boris III of Bulgaria, 309, 314, 320.  
**Boswell in the Light of Recent Discoveries**, 77-93.  
 Boyle, Clara, 'A Servant of the Empire,' 181.  
 Bramwell, Lord, on imprisonment for debt, 101.  
 Brasol, Boris, 'Oscar Wilde, the Man, the Artist,' 14, 18-19.  
 Brend, W. A., 'Traumatic Mental Disorders,' 371.  
 Brickner, Dr Richard M., 299.  
 Bright, John, 189-190.  
 Brown, Ivor, 'Life within Reason,' 372.  
 Browning, Robert, 341.  
 Brüning, Dr, 162.  
 Bülow, Prince, 4-6.  
 Burge, Dr W. E., 307.  
 Burgendorfer, Dr, and National Socialism, 352.  
 Burke, Edmund, 308.  
 Burnett, Charles H., joint editor of 'Boswell's Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides,' 77, 80.  
 Burns, C. Delisle, 'Civilisation, The Next Step,' 179.
- C.
- Caine, Sir Hall, 26-27.  
 Canning, 45-46, 48-49.  
 Carmona, President, 29-30, 41.  
 Carol I of Rumania, 312.  
 Carol III of Rumania, 310, 312-315, 317-320, 322.  
 Castlereagh, 45-48, 60.  
*Cecil, Algernon*, 'Facing the Facts in Foreign Policy,' 154.  
 Cecil, Lady G., 'Life of Robert, Marquis of Salisbury,' 156, 158-160.  
 Chamberlain, Sir Austen, 58-60.  
 Chamberlain, Joseph, 3, 5, 16, 57, 171.  
 Chamberlain, Neville, 13, 46-47, 61-63, 166-167, 169-170, 172.  
 Chamier, J. D., 1.
- Chesterton, G. K., 21, 27-28.  
 Chiang Kai-Shek, 292.  
 Chrimes, S. B., 'English Constitutional Ideas in the Fifteenth Century,' 189, 197-201.  
 Churchill, Winston, 'World Crisis,' 167-168.  
 Clarendon, Earl of, 'The Great Rebellion,' 154-155.  
 Clark, Sir Kenneth, 129.  
 Clarke, M. V., 'Medieval Representation and Consent,' 197.  
 Clinton, Lord, 80-81.  
 Cobden, Richard, 190.  
*Cockburn, Jacqueline*, 'Octavia Hill,' 324.  
 Codreano, 315.  
 Cole, G. D. H., 'Principles of Economic Planning,' 261.  
 Collier, Sir Robert, on imprisonment for debt, 98-99.  
 Collins, Wilkie, 25.  
 Compton, Dr, 231.  
 'Constitutional Year Book,' 368.  
 Corelli, Marie, 26-27.  
*Coulson, Capt. R. G.*, 'Czechoslovakian Adventure,' 130.  
**Counsel's Fees**, 145-153.  
 Cowley, Malcolm, 231.  
 Crispi, 158.  
 Cromwell, Oliver, 191.  
 Crowe, Sir Eyre, 46.  
 Cruse, Amy, 'After the Victorians,' 14-16, 18-19, 22-24, 28—'The Victorians and their Books,' 14-15.  
**Czechoslovakian Adventure**, 130-144.
- D.
- Dandy, Dr Walter E., 299.  
 Davies, A. Mervyn, 'Clive of Plassey,' 361.  
 Davies, W. Robertson, 'Shakespeare's Boy Actors,' 370.  
*Deedes, W. F.*, 'Portugal,' 29.  
 Delarge, M., 7-8.  
 Delbos, M., 61.  
 Delcassé, Théophile, 6, 159-161.

- Dent, J. M., 'The House of Dent,' 188.  
 Derby, Lord, 53, 63.  
 Dickens, Charles, 94.  
 Dodd, Frank, 'An Introduction to the Study of Christianity,' 185.  
 Donaldson, Dr Henry, 301.  
 van Doren, Carl, 'Benjamin Franklin,' 362-363.  
*Downing, Maurice*, 'Post-Victorian Reading,' 14.  
 Dowson, Ernest, 21.  
 Doyle, Conan, 'Sherlock Holmes,' 25.

# E.

- Eden, Anthony, 60-61, 164-165, 168.  
 Elliot, Smith, Sir Grafton, 'Human History,' 157.  
 Ensor, R. C. K., 'England 1870-1914'..2.  
*Evans, Frederic*, 'The Spens Report,' 235.

# F.

- Facing the Facts in Foreign Policy**, 154-172.  
 Farrar, J. A., 7.  
 Fay, Professor, 'Origins of the Great War,' 161.  
 Ferdinand of Rumania, 312.  
 Fisher, H. A. L., 253.  
 Forbes, Sir William, of Pitsligo, 78, 80.  
**Foreign Policy, Facing the Facts in**, 154-172.  
 Fortescue, Sir John, 'De Laudibus Legum Angliæ,' 'Governance of England,' 189.  
 France, Anatole, 20, 222-223.  
 Frankfort, H., 'Cylinder Seals,' 359.  
 Franklin, Benjamin, 229.  
 Friedman-Buchman, Dr, 302.  
 Furnivall, Dr, 325.

# G.

- Gall, Dr Franz, 299.  
 George II of Greece, and Greek plebiscite of 1935..116-117.

- Gladstone, W. E., 52-53, 55.  
 Glover, T. R., 223-224.  
 Goebbels, Dr, 168, 171, 213.  
 Goldsmith, Dr Harry, 302.  
 Goldsmith, Margaret, 'Madame de Stael,' 175-176.  
 Goldsmith, Oliver, and Boswell, 84.  
 Gooch, G. P., 'Before the War: Studies in Diplomacy,' 6, 8, 159, 161, 170.  
*Gordon, Douglas*, 'Wild Life Reserves,' 64.  
 Gore, Bishop, 'Lux Mundi,' 17.  
 Gortchakoff, Prince, 48, 53.  
 Granville, Lord, 53-55.  
 Gray, H. L., 'The Influence of the Commons in Early Legislation,' 200.  
 Grenville, Lord, 47.  
 Grey, Sir Edward, 45, 48, 58, 60, 160.  
 Groener, General, 11.  
*Gummere, Richard M.*, 'Ancient Classics in a Modern World,' 221.

# H.

- Hadow Report, 235, 243.  
 Haggard, Rider, 'King Solomon's Mines,' 22-'She,' 23.  
 Halifax, Lord, 61, 165-166.  
 Hall, G. Stanley, 300.  
 Haller, Professor, on Prince Bülow, 4-5.  
 'Handbook of British Birds,' vol. 2, 186-187.  
 Hanson, Lawrence, 'The Life of S. T. Coleridge: The Early Years,' 364.  
 Hardy, Thomas, 26.  
*Harlech, Lord*, 'Recent Developments at the National Gallery,' 121.  
 Harris, Frank, 18.  
 Harris, Mary, 340.  
 Hay, Malcolm V., 'The Enigma of James II,' 363-364.  
*Headlam, Lt-Colonel Sir Cuthbert, Bart.*, 'Planned National Economy,' 259.  
 Healy, Dr William, 302-303.

- Hideyoshi, Toyotomi, 287, 289.  
 Hill, G. Birkbeck, editor of 'Boswell's Life of Johnson,' 77.  
 Hill, Octavia, 324-341.  
 von Hindenburg, Field Marshal, 11.  
 Hindzie, Dr, 301.  
 History and Destiny To-day, 248-258.  
 History in Blue Books, 45-63.  
 'History of "The Times," The,' 357-358.  
 Hitler, 115-116, 162, 168, 170, 213, 314, 319-320.  
 Holdsworth, Sir William, 'Some Makers of English Law,' 177-178.  
 Hope, Anthony, 27.  
 Horton-Smith, C., 'The Flight of Birds,' 187.  
 Huddleston, Sisley, 'In My Time,' 164.  
 Huxley, Julian, 66.

## I.

- In Gaol for Debt, 94-106.  
 Intelligence, The Anatomy of, 299-307.  
 'Interim Report of the Committee on House of Commons Personnel and Politics, 1264-1832'..189, 193-194.  
 Isham, Col Ralph, 79, 81-82.

## J.

- Jacobs, W. W., 27.  
 Japan, advance since 1868 of, 284-287—militaristic tradition of, 287-289, 291—and Korea, 289—and Manchuria, 290-291—and the Chinese adventure, 292-293—ultimate aim of, 293-298.  
 Japanese Ambitions, 284-298.  
 Jerome, Jerome K., 27.  
 Johnson, Samuel, and Boswell, 84, 86-87, 93.  
 Jones, Sir Thomas Artemus, K.C., LL.D., 'In Gaol for Debt,' 94.  
 Jowett, Benjamin, 228.

## K.

- Kaiser, The: Octogenarian, 1-13.  
 Katzenelbogen, Dr Solomon, 302.  
 Keith, E. C., 'A Countryman's Creed,' 185-186.  
 Kingsley, Charles, and Octavia Hill, 325.  
 Kipling, Rudyard, 23.  
 Konoye, Prince, 295.

## L.

- Lawrence, D. H., 346.  
 League of Nations, 52-60, 120, 162-166, 169.  
 La Gallienne, Richard, 21.  
 Liddell Hart, B. H., 'Through the Fog of War,' 179-180.  
 Lindsley, Dr Ronald B., 305.  
 Lloyd George, D., 16, 162-163, 168-169.  
 Lloyd, Roger B., 'History and Destiny To-day,' 248.  
 Locarno Pact, 60.  
 Locke, John, 225.  
 Lockwood, D. P., 'The Haverford Plan,' 221.  
 Loewe, H., joint compiler of 'Rabbinic Anthology,' 183-184.  
 Longford, Dr, on Japanese administration of Korea, 289.

## M.

- Macaulay, Lord, and Boswell, 77-78, 93.  
 Machray, Robert, 'The Struggle for the Danube,' 180.  
 Mackail, J. W., 223.  
 Macmillan, Harold, M.P., 'The Middle Way: A Study of the Problem of Economic and Social Progress in a Free and Democratic Society,' 259-260, 262, 268-272, 275-279, 280-281.  
 Mahaffy, J. P., 222.  
 Maine, Sir Henry, 190.  
 Malone, Edmund, 78 and note, 80-81.

Marconi, 16.

Marriott, Sir John A. R., 'Parliament in the Fifteenth Century,' 189—'The Eastern Question,' 310.

Marshall, Dorothy, 'The Rise of George Canning,' 360-361.

Maughan, Lord, 167.

Marx, Karl, 248, 250, 253.

von Marxon, Dr Fleischle, 303-304.

Maurice, Frederick Denison, 325, 327.

Meredith, George, 26.

Metternich, 47-48, 50.

Metz, S. S., 'New Money for New Men,' 259-262, 272-277, 279, 281.

Michael the Brave, of Rumania, 309-311.

Miles, Wilfred, 'History of the Great War—Military Operations,' 358.

Mill, John Stuart, 234.

Monroe, President, 49.

Montefiore, Claude, joint compiler of 'Rabbinic Anthology,' 183-184.

Moore, Audrey, 'Serengeti,' 371-372.

Morley, Edith J., 'Boswell in the Light of Recent Discoveries,' 77.

Morris, Helen, 'Portrait of a Chef,' 373-374.

Morris, Lewis, 20-21.

Mounsey, Mrs, 78.

Mowat, R. B., D.Litt., 'History in Blue Books,' 45.

Mussolini, 60, 164.

## N.

Napoleon I, 109-110.

Napoleon III, 48, 50-51.

National Gallery, Recent Developments at the, 121-129.

Nietzsche, 344, 346.

Norris, Herbert, 'Costume and Fashion,' 370-371.

Norris, Samuel, 'Manx Memories and Movements,' 372-373.

## O.

O'Conroy, Professor, on Japan's aims, 297-298.

Octavia Hill, 324-341.

Osler, Sir William, 300.

Oulié, Marthe, 'Charcot of the Antarctic,' 367.

## P.

Paget, Mrs, 'Henry Luke Paget,' 367-368.

Palmerston, Lord, 33-34, 45, 49-51, 61, 63.

Parliament in the Fifteenth Century, 189-205.

Peel, Sir Robert, 190.

Pemberton, W. Baring, 'Lord North,' 361-362.

Penn, William, 225, 229.

Penson, Lillian M., joint editor of 'A Century of British Blue Books, 1814-1914'..45—'Foundations of British Foreign Policy, from Pitt (1792) to Salisbury (1902)'..45-48.

Perry, Commodore, 284, 294.

Perry, Richard, 'At the Turn of the Tide,' 186.

Petrie, Sir Charles, Bart, 'The Plebiscite: Its Use and Abuse,' 107—'Rumania,' 308.

Phillips, C. E. Lucas, 'Cromwell's Captain's,' 176.

Phillips, Stephen, 21.

Pickthorn, K., 'Early Tudor Government,' 189, 198-199.

Pitt, William, and principles of British foreign policy, 47-48.

Planned National Economy, 259-283.

Plebiscite, The: Its Use and Abuse, 107-120.

Plebiscite, difference between ancient and modern form of, 107-108—in Revolutionary France, 108-109—under Napoleon I and Napoleon III, 109-112—in 19th century Italy, 112-113, 118—in Norway, 113—after the Great War, 113, 118—in Schleswig and Silesia, 114—in the Saar, 114-115,

- 118—use by Hitler of, 115-116—  
in Greece, 116-117—undemocratic  
character of, 117-120.
- Plucknett, T. F. T., 'The Lancas-  
trian Constitution,' 189, 197-199.
- Podolsky, Edward, M.D., 'The  
Anatomy of Intelligence,' 299.
- Poe, Edgar Allen, 25.
- Pollard, A. F., on Wolsey, 154—  
'The Evolution of Parliament,'  
189, 196-197, 199-200.
- Pope, Alexander, 95.
- Portsmouth, Treaty of, 285.
- Portugal, 29-44.
- Pound, Ezra, 234.
- Portugal, recent transformation of,  
29-30—military position of, 31-32  
—financial position of, 32-33—and  
the British Alliance, 33-41, 43-44  
—and the Spanish War, 35-41—  
colonial empire of, 41-43.
- Post-Victorian Reading, 14-28.
- Pottle, Fredk. A., 'Boswell's Liter-  
ary Career. An Illustrated Biblio-  
graphy,' 77, 92-93—'The Private  
Papers of James Boswell from  
Malahide Castle. A Catalogue,'  
77—joint editor of 'Private  
Papers of James Boswell from  
Malahide Castle in the Collection  
of Lieut-Col Ralph Isham,' 77, 81,  
83-92; 'Boswell's Journal of a  
Tour to the Hebrides,' 77, 80.
- Pottle, Marion S., 'The Private  
Papers of James Boswell from  
Malahide Castle. A Catalogue,'  
77.
- R.**
- Rand, E. K., 'The Ancient Classics  
and the New Humanism,' 221.
- von Rebeur-Paschwitz, Admiral, 5.
- Recent Developments at the  
National Gallery, 121-129.
- Refugees in England, 206-220.
- Rice, Stanley, 'Japanese Am-  
bitions,' 298.
- Riezler, Walter, 'Beethoven,' 364-  
365.
- de Rivera, General Primo, plebi-  
scite of, 115.
- Robbins, L. C., 261.
- Roberts, Henry D., 'History of the  
Royal Pavilion, Brighton,' 366-  
367.
- Robinson, Henry Crabbe, 'Books  
and their Writers,' 182-183.
- Romilly, Lord, on imprisonment for  
debt, 100.
- Roots of a Nation, The, 342-355.
- Rosebery, late Lord, 46, 55, 57, 129,  
160.
- Rosenberg, Herr, 251, 253.
- Roth, Cecil, 'Anglo-Jewish Letters:  
1158-1927', 368-369.
- Rouvier, M., 6.
- Rowntree, B. S., 268.
- de Ruggiero, Guido, on plebiscites,  
108.
- Rumania, 308-323.
- Rumania, unifying influence of  
Latin origin on people of, 308-  
309—effects of Turkish domina-  
tion over, 310—effects of Great  
War on, 311-312—place of Crown  
in life of, 312-313—place of  
minorities in, 312, 314-316—part  
played by Iron Guard in, 314-315—  
resources of, 317—foreign policy  
of, 318-322—importance to West-  
ern Powers of, 322-323.
- Runciman, Lord, 167.
- Ruskin, John, and Octavia Hill,  
325-327, 329-330, 333.
- Russell, Bertrand, 344.
- Russell, Lord John, 51-52.
- S.**
- Salazar, Dr Oliviera, 29-30, 32-33,  
36, 38-39, 41, 43, 44.
- Salisbury, late Marquis of, 2, 52-57,  
61, 156-160.
- Sargant, Dr William, 303.
- Schamp, Dr H. M., 307.
- Scott, Geoffrey, joint editor of  
'Private Papers of James Boswell  
from Malahide Castle in the Col-  
lection of Lieut-Col Ralph Isham,'  
77-82.
- Scott Holland, Canon, 17.
- Seely, Sir John, 254.
- Shaw, Bernard, 28.

Shuttleworth, Canon, 17-18, 26.  
 Sims, G. R., 22.  
 Smith, H. Maynard, 'Pre-Reformation England,' 178-179.  
 Smith, Dr Southwood, 328-329.  
 Solonovich, Ivan, 'Escape from Russian Chains,' 181-182.  
 Some Recent Books, 173-188, 356-374.  
 'Soviet Comes of Age, The,' 358-359.  
 Spann, Othmar, 250.  
 Spender, J. A., 'Fifty Years of Europe,' 159.  
 Spens Report, The, 235-247.  
 Stalin, 323.  
 Stephenson, John, editor of 'Letters of the Prince Consort, 1831-1861; A Royal Correspondence,' 175.  
 Stevenson, R. L., 'Treasure Island,' 22—'Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde,' 25-26.  
 Stubbs, W., 'Constitutional History of England,' 189, 196, 198, 200, 202, 204-205.  
 Sturge, Charles, 'Cuthbert Tunstal,' 176-177.  
 'Survey of London,' 366.

T.

Talbot de Malahide, Lord, 78.  
 Temperley, Harold, joint editor of 'A Century of British Blue Books, 1814-1914...45; 'Foundations of British Foreign Policy, from Pitt (1792) to Salisbury (1902),'...45-48, 51, 53, 55-56.  
 Temple, William, 78, 81.  
 Thompson, Francis, 21.  
 Thorne, Guy, 17.  
 Tinker, Chauncy Brewster, 'Young Boswell, 78—editor of 'Letters of James Boswell,' 77, 79-80.  
 Titulesco, M., 318-319.  
 Tolstoi, 19-20.

Tout, Professor, 199.  
 Toynbee, Arnold J., 'A Study of History, Volumes I-III,' 248, 254-258.  
 Travis, Lee Edward, 306.  
 Trevelyan, G. M., 'Garibaldi and the Making of Italy,' 112.  
 Trotsky, 249.  
 Tyler, E. B., 231.  
 Tyndale, William, translator of 'The New Testament, 1534'..356-357.

V.

Valéry, Paul, 231.  
 Varé, Daniele, 'Laughing Diplomat,' 174.  
 Vitruvius, 232-233.

W.

Wagner, Dr Rudolph, 300.  
 Wallis, N. Hardy, editor of 'The New Testament translated by William Tyndale, 1534'..356-357.  
 Ward, Mrs Humphry, 17-18, 24.  
 Wedgwood, Josiah C., M.P., editor of 'History of Parliament, Vol. I. Biographies of the Members of the Commons House, 1439-1509. Vol. II. Register of the Ministers and of the Members of both Houses. 1439-1509'..189, 191-193, 195-196, 199, 201-205.  
 Wells, H. G., 27.  
 Wethered, H. N., 'On the Art of Thackeray,' 183.  
 Whitehead, A. N., 'Modes of Thought,' 221-222, 227.  
 Wickwire, Dr G. C., 307.  
 Wilde, Oscar, 18-19.  
 Wild Life Reserves, 64-76.  
 Wilds, E. H., 'The Foundations of Modern Education,' 221.  
 William II, ex-Kaiser, 1-13, 57.  
 Williams, B., 'William Pitt,' 155.

Williams, C. H., 'The Modern Historian,' 248, 253-254.

Wilson, President, 162-163, 234.

Wingfield-Stratford, Esmé, 'The Making of a Gentleman,' 173-174.

de Witte, Baron Jean, 308.

Wootton, Barbara, 'Plan or No Plan,' 261.

Wykeham, William of, 236.

## Y.

Yeats, W. B., 234.

Yorke, Harriot. 340.

## Z.

Zog, King of Albania, 309.

Zola, Emile, 19-20.

Zukerman, William, 'Refugees in England,' 206.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND VOLUME.

# World News by Magazine

This has been our business for over seventy years and we feel competent to give you the service which you desire.

We are the largest and most reliable agency for prompt delivery of Foreign and Domestic Periodicals in this Country.

The latest English, Irish and German Publications we carry in stock.

We call especial attention to the beautiful Christmas Editions, forming a group of magazines that have a peculiar interest to people of culture.

Our subscription prices include postage to all parts of the United States, Cuba, Mexico, Porto Rico and P. I.

Our BACK NUMBER DEPT. can furnish quick service in supplying you with old issues.

For quick and efficient service send your orders for Foreign Publications to

**THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**

Division of THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY, INC.

131 Varick Street, New York City

*Send for Price List*

